Class 204R Book M862

General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

HE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE STUDY AND THE STREET

'Dictionaries are fascinating books, and this
is one of the *most* fascinating.'—*Spectator.*

THE VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT

Illustrated from the Papyri and other
non-literary sources

BY

PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, D.D.

AND

PROFESSOR GEORGE MILLIGAN, D.D.

Parts I. II. and III.

'An extensive undertaking, of an importance worthy of the distinguished Biblical scholars who are engaged upon it.'—*Times.*

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
Publishers, London, E.C. 4

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE STUDY AND THE STREET

BY

JAMES HOPE MOULTON

LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
GREENWOOD PROFESSOR OF HELLENISTIC GREEK AND
INDO-EUROPEAN PHILOLOGY IN MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY
TUTOR IN NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
WESLEYAN COLLEGE, DODSBURY
D.LITT. (LOND.); HON. D.D. (EDINBURGH, BERLIN AND GRÖNINGEN)
HON. D.C.L. (DURHAM)

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO
MCMXIX

204 R
M 862

65499

Ap 7 '19

PREFACE

The present volume of my brother's papers and lectures owes its existence to a belief that those who knew him and valued him as a teacher would not desire that any of his work should remain unpublished or relatively inaccessible. Rightly or wrongly, it was felt that the very lightness of his touch, the irrepressible gaiety of his presentation of things, and the informality of his style were calculated to obtain for him a hearing from some who would turn away from a more solemn treatment as too dull; while others will discern that learning need not be ponderous in order to be profound, and that scintillating scholarship is no impossible contradiction. Moreover there was the impression that even in those matters where there was no pretence to originality, a pronouncement from one who had gained so distinguished a place in the world of scholarship might carry a degree of weight and conviction which would be entirely lacking from an identical pronouncement coming through other channels.

This explains not only the publication of these varied papers, but also why they are sent forth just as they stand, without any attempt to dress them up in the accepted garb of literary proprieties. Had my brother lived, he would most certainly have made numerous emendations both in substance and in style, for no one was ever less disposed to regard a question as closed, or more ready to welcome new light. But had I started to polish and amend, even had I been qualified to do so, I should have run the risk of impairing the individuality without enhancing the value.

Two subjects of inquiry may be said to have appealed to him more forcibly than any others—New Testament Exegesis and Comparative Religion: and this volume represents, to some degree, the meeting ground of these two interests. He was never so immersed in New Testament Greek as to be indifferent to the worth of the contributions made by other religious systems; neither was he ever so fascinated by the greatness and beauty of non-Christian systems of thought as to waver for one moment in his conviction as to the uniqueness, the supremacy, and the finality of the Christian revelation. His mind resembled a hospitable salon in which numerous diverse and even antithetic interests and views met without jostling, and probably with a considerable degree of mutual advantage; and this catholicity found characteristic expression in his writing, his platform advocacy, and pre-eminently in his friendships. Whatever may have been his final views on the exegesis of John i. 9, there is no doubt whatever of his own personal belief that there is a 'light which lighteth every man coming into the world.'

In the selection of material for this volume I have not enjoyed the advantage of any guidance from expressed wishes or intentions of my brother, but I have tried to act in accordance with what I knew of his disposition as reflected in the title. He was no intellectual recluse, acquiring learning for its own sake. What he acquired in the study he imparted in the street—to adapt Bacon's famous contrast; and it is not too much to say that his motive in all such acquisition was practical rather than academic. If a field of study had no outlet into practical life, he felt little disposition to enter it, although it must be added that he showed exceptional readiness to detect such outlets.

In my varied perplexities my brother's friends have been most kind, and I cannot place on record in detail my obligations to them all: but in the forefront of the volume I would mention three who have given me the guidance without which I should never have dared to act, and who have placed the resources of their knowledge and judgment at my disposal—Rev. Dr. George Milligan of Aberdeen, Dr. A. S. Peake of Manchester, and Mr. Henry Guppy of the John Rylands Library. I would also express my grateful appreciation of the helpful services rendered to me in many ways by Miss Doris Burgess of Eccles, one of my brother's pupils at Manchester. My thanks are also due to the Methodist Publishing House, to the Publishers of the *Expositor*, the *International Review of Missions*, of *East and West*, of the *Classical Review*, of the *War Time Papers*, and of the *Deansgate Lectures*, for permission, most readily and graciously granted, to reprint material from their columns.

W. FIDDIAN MOULTON.

CONTENTS

PAGE

HOW STANDS THE BIBLE: THREE LECTURES ON BIBLICAL APOLOGETICS—

I. 'THE INFALLIBILITIES ARE GONE' . . . 1

II. FORCES OF DISINTEGRATION 20

III. THE OLD TESTAMENT 31

SYNOPTIC STUDIES—

I. THE BEATITUDES 47

[*Expositor*, Aug. 1906]

II. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE SAYINGS OF JESUS 61

[*Expositor*, July 1907]

III. SOME CRITICISMS ON PROFESSOR HARNACK'S 'SAYINGS OF JESUS' 71

[*Expositor*, May 1909]

MARANATHA—IN THE FIRST AND THE TWENTIETH CENTURIES 83

[*Free Church Council Year Book*, 1911

PAGE

BISHOP WESTCOTT 94

[*London Quarterly Review*, July 1903]

THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE AND THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 117

[Inaugural Lecture, Manchester, Jan. 1906]

THE PRIMITIVE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS . 145

[*Classical Review*, March 1915]

BRITISH AND GERMAN SCHOLARSHIP 157

[*War Time Papers*]

A CAMBRIDGE ORIENTAL SCHOLAR 169

[*London Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1905]

ZOROASTRIAN CONCEPTION OF A FUTURE LIFE . . 180

[Victoria Institute, April 1915]

THE CHALLENGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY 199

[*London Quarterly Review*, April 1902]

THE 'GOLDEN BOUGH' 213

[*London Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1912]

PARSISM AND CHRISTIANITY 227

[*East and West*, Oct. 1907]

THE PARSIS IN INDIA 239

[*East and West*, July 1916]

PAGE
SYNCRETISM IN RELIGION 253

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS 269
[*Deansgate Lectures*]

THE WORD AND THE WORLD 288
[*International Review of Missions*, Jan. 1913]

THREE LECTURES ON BIBLICAL APOLOGETICS[1]

LECTURE I

HOW STANDS THE BIBLE?

'THE INFALLIBILITIES ARE GONE!'

THE object of these lectures will I fear seem unduly ambitious to some who recognise—but certainly less vividly than the lecturer does—that to present in such small compass 'the modern case for Christianity' is beyond the power of any properly equipped exponent of so great a subject. I hasten therefore to show how humble is the task I have set myself—humble, and yet I am sure needing to be done in every place where thoughtful Christians gather together and study the signs of the times. The mere limitation of four lectures spares me the impossible task of presenting the case for Christianity from every point of view. I am not a philosopher, not a historian, not a man of science, and I cannot enter on fields with which I am not familiar. And assuredly if I announce Infallibility as the subject of my first lecture, I am in no danger of either saying or thinking that *one* infallibility survives the wreck, and endeavours to press its confident dogmas on those who hear. I am no Pope, and no new theologian. I only try to bring before you the

---

[[1] Dr. Moulton makes reference to *four* lectures, but no trace of the fourth can be found among his papers. The line which it would have taken may be inferred from pp. 3, 13. Cf. his *Religion and Religions*, where the chapter on 'Christianity and other Religions' is followed by that on 'The Christ which is to be.']

case for our religion as it appeals to me, in the hope that what has helped me may help some of you to believe that we can be fearless enthusiasts for all the new knowledge that the twentieth century has inherited or created, and yet sincere and fervent followers of Him who ‘ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.’

I said I was not a new theologian, but I must begin at once to qualify. The term has been violently annexed for a special meaning, and thus understood I can have nothing of it. But this does not mean that I am prepared to stand still. There are different directions of progress ; and if some are minded to travel northward into the realms of ice, I am not going to let them call me unprogressive because I prefer to press on to meet the sun. I shall be trying to expound part of ‘ the *modern* case for Christianity.’ Shall we be told that this is only the same as the old case, Paley’s *Evidences* are good enough for us, as they were for our fathers ? There are conservative theologians who seem to think so. A *Bible Dictionary* has recently been published in which many articles on subjects of crucial importance are actually reprinted from an excellent book that came out forty years ago. In what other sphere of knowledge would this be possible ? Can I equip my son at school with the text-books I used when I was a boy ? New facts have been perpetually coming in, new theories have been advanced, new points of view have demanded attention. Is Christianity to make no effort to answer new questions and solve new problems, to assimilate new knowledge and meet the new conditions of a new age ? Surely to say ‘ no ’ means that Christian thought is to go into bankruptcy. If Theology is in truth the Queen of the Sciences—and if she be science at all, she must be queen—it follows that she must be renewed with every generation. After all, Theology is the application of human thought to the things of God ; and it is God Himself Who still says to us, ‘ Behold, I make all things new ! ’

To many reverent minds the progress of thought from one generation to another seems marked mostly by the abandonment of beliefs that were cherished in our fathers' time. Now, of course, it is perfectly true that we cannot make progress without destruction and denial of many half-truths or even no-truths that once were held to be of Divine authority. And unfortunately in any consecutive exposition it is inevitable that we largely put the destructive in the foreground. If we are going to build a larger church on the site of the old one, we must begin by pulling down what no longer meets the needs of a prosperous and growing community. And there are multitudes, with whom we who are clearing the site intensely sympathise, who take pleasure in every stone of a building that was for them the very gate of heaven. I only plead with these our brothers that they should wait, and trust the while that a better house is being reared than that which they hold so dear. There is a criticism that is purely destructive. It can find reasons for denying or doubting any proposition that has ever been put forth. But no one could come in such a spirit to present a case for Christianity. We must be constructive at every point, and never for an instant lose sight of the higher and greater truth which we mean to set in the place of that which is inadequate and outworn. If in the argument of these lectures I seem to you to be often busy with denials of what you early learnt as truth, I ask you to bear with me to the end. The keystone of our structure cannot be put in till we have prepared for it on different lines, pulling down here and building there. And when in my concluding lecture I have set forth what is the one central truth on which I conceive Christian faith must rest in the twentieth century, I have no fear that you will find it differ from the truth that inspired the Apostles to go forth into the world of the first century and preach a Gospel that has not yet felt the touch of time.

There is one other preliminary caution which I ought to bring in at an early point in my argument. These lectures are ‘apologetic,’ that is *defensive*, and their method must necessarily differ seriously from that which we should adopt in an exposition of Christian truth for use within the Church. We are concerned with the defence of the Faith against attacks from without, with the best methods of persuading outsiders who look upon it with none of our presuppositions. Clearly in such a task we must restrict ourselves mainly to our strongest positions. It will be useless for us to lay stress on arguments which the man we want to convince will immediately set aside. There are many things we ourselves can believe which are rather things to be defended than useful weapons of defence. In putting these into the background we are not abandoning them to the enemy, we are only forcing to the front those parts of our case which are most likely to produce conviction. At the same time it is well for us to remember that it is just the most vital truths which do thus come to the front in any well-considered argument for the faith. Apologetics will do the believer a supreme service when it makes him realise where is his surest foundation.

And so to my title, which may well seem to some of you rather alarming. It is an utterance of a dear friend of my own—saint, scholar, practical philanthropist, fearless fighter for every cause that Evangelical Free Churchmen hold dear. It is no Rationalist Press Association advocate who thus exultantly cries that ‘the Infallibilities are gone.’ There are probably many here who have listened to him as President of the National Free Church Council. You at any rate will have no misgivings as to the robustness of the Christian faith which Dr. Rendel Harris rests on something stronger than infallibility.

If we analyse the reasons why a belief in some sort of infallibility in religious faith has been and is so powerful among men of all shades of opinion, we shall find that they mostly come to one. In the language of the advertisements, infallibility ‘supplies a felt want.’ Vast numbers of men and women are seeking some stronger authority to lean on whenever they have to decide on action of any kind from which important results may follow. Many more, who in the ordinary business of life are confident and self-reliant, are afraid of venturing out of the daylight of external facts without a guide in whom they can implicitly trust. Like Dante, they find themselves *per una selva oscura*, and they must have their Virgil. The universal prevalence of sacerdotal institutions throughout the world testifies to the strength of this tendency. Men crave infallible guidance in things of religion, and they are all too easily persuaded of the credentials of those who profess to satisfy their craving. And so we find even hard-headed, independent, argumentative men of the world yielding easily to that which one would have thought they would repel as insulting to their freedom. They claim to be the best judges of all that affects their own business or profession. But in religion there is the expert, the priest, whose business it is to find out these things. We trust our bodies implicitly to the expert, the doctor; we trust our souls with equal readiness to him whose function it is to know what we need to know.

Now this craving for infallible guidance—whether it be that of a man, a church, or a book—is absolutely natural, pathetically natural, I should say. But as we think of it more closely, are we not uneasily conscious that it looks only too much like a resource of spiritual indolence? We want guidance upon a road that stretches out into the infinite unknown. That we should not wander there into By-path Meadow is evidently of supreme importance for our own welfare. Is it safe for us to trust a guide in a matter so momentous without the most convincing evidence that he has traversed that road and will not lead us astray?

And yet we take such guides on their own self-recommendation, or follow implicitly a guidance which only our own assumptions invest with inerrant authority in fields where its own promise never professes to take us. We will look at the credentials of the Infallibilities presently. Meanwhile I would unhesitatingly declare that *facts* are forcing us to accept the deposition of every external authority that would exercise an absolute monarchy over the human mind in matters of religion. God is showing us that He never meant us to have such guidance, and that we are far better without it. After all, as Butler demonstrated long ago, Probability—not Infallibility—is the guide of life. In practical conduct we rarely come to any question that has not two sides. We may decide for one side or the other with the deepest conviction ; but in most of the problems that really perplex us we find that some one else whom we respect has decided the other way. It is our business to weigh the arguments *pro* and *con*, and make a rational choice. Is it not antecedently likely that in matters of religion God would shut us out from mathematical certainty, would bid us think for ourselves with earnestness befitting the greatness of the issue, and then act on our honest conviction ?

To an audience like this I shall not need to spend much time in examining the credentials of an Infallible Church. It may appeal to certain types of mind, but those types are rarely found among believers in freedom and progress. We can partially understand, as watchers from outside, those who are fascinated by the glamour of the past, and persuade themselves that the collective wisdom of our ancestors has settled all the problems for us. But we cannot imagine ourselves satisfied in heart or head by such an appeal. I might illustrate by a personal experience. Some months ago, in a newspaper controversy with a Roman Canon, I remarked that I could not concede him the name Catholic without an adjective, having myself as much right to the name, or more. His reply on the lines of popular use I need not dwell on, but he added that Augustine settled the use of the title with the Donatists long ago. That is fairly typical. You and I will immediately say that Augustine settled nothing for us except so far as we may be satisfied with an argument he used. Augustine is for us a very powerful mind of the past, who advanced Christian thought in many directions, but who has no more right than plain John Smith of Little Bethel to dictate to us what we are to believe. I do not even trouble to turn up in his bulky tomes the passage which may tell me how Augustine defined Catholicism. He cannot alter the fact that Catholic means Universal, and that a sect which unchurches Christians to east of it and Christians to west of it cannot monopolise such a title without something worse than abuse of language. The fact is that if there were such a thing as a Catholic Church, defined as a single communion spread all over the world, with single government, and including absolutely all who accept Christ at all, we should be bound to see the hand of God in the existence of such a body, and agree with its doctrines as imposed upon us by an authority unmistakably divine. But when we find the limits of this ‘ Catholic ’ Church too narrow to make room for the sections of Christendom which have done most for human knowledge and progress at home, and the spread of the Gospel in heathen lands—when we find in our own country champions of two denominations claiming the name ‘ Catholic ’ and alike cheerfully putting outside the pale all those who do not belong to their own section, we feel that there is no claim of universality which is strong enough to impose its authority upon our understanding. As regards the Roman Church, we need hardly labour further the rejection of its demand to be implicitly obeyed. A mere glance at the map of the world will remind us that where its sway is undisputed there is political degeneracy, intellectual slavery, and spiritual decay.

Rome's solution of the problems of modern thought is to be found in the Schoolmen. She has no use for new facts or new thoughts. *Anathema sit* is her only argument, *semper eadem* her supreme boast. A world of life and thought moves on and lets her alone.

It might seem superfluous to show that the infallibility we deny to Rome is equally impossible for other churches. If the consensus of the Middle Ages cannot absolve us from the duty of examining and restating truth for ourselves, we may be quite sure that we cannot transfer this privilege to the wisdom of later generations, even though our authorities now include the most enlightened and spiritual forces in Christendom. The Thirty-nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, or Wesley's Notes and Fifty-three Sermons, for all the excellence that may be claimed for them as doctrinal statements, can impose no authoritative obligation upon a Protestant conscience. Doctrinal standards are essentially conveniences for classification. They express in general terms the lines which we recognise as summarising our own thought, and we give them a voluntary assent. They can never be for us a substitute for independent thinking.

We are ready then to admit that with no man, no body of men, and no succession of men, however prolonged, rests the right to dictate to us authoritatively what we must hold as religious faith. The Reformation shattered this refuge of spiritual indolence once for all. It is often said that it did so only by substituting another infallibility, that of the Book, whose deliverance from the custody of a priesthood set Europe free from intellectual and spiritual bondage. Whether the Reformers contemplated this result we need not stay to inquire : Luther at any rate treated the Bible with astonishing freedom. The vital question for us is not the history of the idea, but its cogency for us to-day. Is the Bible infallible ? If it is, we shall still have to discuss its interpretation, a subject on which modern science has much to say. We will keep at present to the one point: Is the Bible all inspired, or parts of it inspired, and does its inspiration preclude the possibility of unhistorical or unscientific statements, or doctrines which we must reject as untrue? Now it is perfectly plain that, whether we like it or no, the man in the street to-day insists on asking these questions, and expects a straightforward answer. We cannot put him off with authority. The judgment of men or of churches will not satisfy him; if the Bible is infallible, he demands that we should prove it. And here surely he is within his right. The matter is far too important for him to take it at second-hand on trust. How are we to answer him? Shall we say that the Bible claims to be infallible—that it is the Word of God who cannot lie? Our questioner will still ask how we know this. Suppose for the moment that it does make this claim—does that prove the claim justified? 'Thou bearest witness of thyself; thy witness is not true.' So we reply at once to any man who would have us believe on his own authority that he can speak with infallible and inerrant voice on all the problems of life. If we are to treat the Bible differently, we must at least know why.

Now there is one line on which I believe we could reasonably defend the Bible's claim to infallibility—*if* such a claim were made. The question at present is accordingly whether the Bible does make such a claim. That it maintains the reality of 'inspiration' is unquestionable. It tells us what we may expect from 'every scripture inspired of God'—thereby making it clear that there are such scriptures, but giving no definition of their identity.[1] What are the functions of inspired scripture, according to this famous passage? It is 'profitable,' we are told—what for? For scientific and historical information—to give us infallible guidance when we ask how the world was made, and how human life has developed, so as to save us the trouble of researching for ourselves, and even to rebuke us for presumption if we do so and come to different conclusions ? Not at all. The 'sacred writings' are able to make us wise *unto salvation* ; they are to furnish equipment for 'the man of God' for an absolutely practical purpose, the achievement of every kind of 'good work.' There is nothing here that suggests infallibility. Inspiration is something incomparably greater. Many a God-inspired deed has been accomplished in the power of an idea that was wrong, and is even revolting to us to-day. No one beyond the childhood stage of religion could believe that God took pleasure in a human sacrifice. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum*—'so foul the wrongs to which religion could prompt ! '—is the stinging comment of the great Roman rationalist when he has told of the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father, and we sorrowfully echo the comment to-day. Yet we read of a nobler victim, 'the daughter of the warrior Gileadite,' who subdued herself to her father's will with enthusiasm, believing that her death was the price of her country's deliverance :—

---

[1] 2 Tim. iii. 16. The marginal translation (virtually that of the Authorised Version) is equally possible as a matter of grammar. But it leaves us equally without definition as to what 'every scripture' includes.

> How beautiful a thing it was to die
> For God and for my sire !

And the world is the richer for the golden deed of Jephthah's daughter, for all the horror of the idea that prompted that inspired self-sacrifice.

But to return. The typical passage we have discussed of course has reference to the Old Testament alone. Neither here nor anywhere else in the New Testament have we any evidence to justify a claim of inspiration, still less of infallibility, for all the contents of the Hebrew Canon.[1] And when we come to the

---

[1] 2 Peter i. 21 says that there were men who spoke under Divine impulse, but not that all the writers of the Old Testament were thus moved.

New Testament, which matters immeasurably more, we have less evidence still. One writer[1] speaks of Paul's letters as 'scripture,' and says that there are many difficult things in them 'which the ignorant and unstedfast wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.' Apparently then, if there is infallibility, it is only the strong who are to profit by it; the wayfaring man, if a fool, is likely to err therein, and not apparently by any fault that he can with certainty avoid. We turn to the one passage in which a New Testament writer definitely tells us about his methods and his purpose, the preface[2] to the Gospel which preserves for us the matchless story of the Prodigal Son. Does Paul's 'beloved physician' claim an inspiration which dictated to him the wonderful narrative of the Master's words and works, so as to save him the trouble of research and guarantee the perfect accuracy of every detail? Not at all. Luke tells us that he had 'traced the course of all things accurately from the first'—or (as the words may possibly be interpreted) had 'examined all the facts afresh.' In either case he comes before us like any other historian, ready to take endless pains to secure the correctness of a story that matters so much to the world. There is inspiration in the Book—no doubt whatever about that! But the writer who was its channel was a man and not a machine.

Our last sentence gives us a hint which we may profitably follow up. The writers of the Bible were *men*, and God did nothing to dehumanise them. Does not the fact as it comes out of the mist into clear light force us to be asking *why*? And are not some reasons very obvious when once we have realised that such was God's will? Suppose this Book had been miraculously dictated from heaven to human scribes, so that no opening for mistake or omission could possibly exist. That would of course show that God accounted it of supreme importance that His revelation should

[1] 2 Peter iii. 16.

[2] Luke i. 1-4.

come to men entirely without flaw, in His own perfect and final words. How passing strange then that having brought this great gift to earth He should have immediately ceased to watch over its preservation in the same inerrant form ! From the earliest days the circumstances of their transmission laid the Gospels open to an unusual amount of error in copying—for error there must be when no two copies can be found to agree throughout. It is far easier to be sure that we have the exact original words of Plato's writing than to guarantee the correct preservation of a Gospel. And even when we have settled to our own satisfaction the Greek text which we believe authentic, there remains the task of translation, and not infrequently this introduces great uncertainty. There is one passage[1] where scholars of repute are at variance between 'Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning' and 'How is it that I even speak to you at all ?' Where is the inspired voice to tell us which of these alternative renderings expresses the meaning of inspired words ? Surely if God wrought so great a miracle to produce an infallible Book on earth, He would have worked smaller ones to secure that you and I should have in our own tongue an exact equivalent of the very words He originally gave ! He has certainly done nothing of the kind. May we not infer that He counted it essential for His Book to come to us under perfectly human conditions ? It was to tell us of Him who compassed Himself with human infirmity, that in our flesh He might lift us up to God. How could it reach our minds or our hearts if it came in a guise utterly different from anything we know ?

May I leave the Infallible Book here, or must I ask another question that goes deeper ? Christian thought to-day will insist with unanimity that there is something within the Bible the claim of which transcends all else and is itself the guarantee of it all. What of the Master Himself? is He infallible? The answer to that question I must reserve to the last lecture, for it is the climax of my argument. Here I will only point out that if His words were thus infallible as He spoke them, they come to us through a whole series of distracting mediums which affect their form most seriously. He spoke nearly always in Galilean Aramaic, a dialect of which we have hardly any written remains of the same period. His words were written down from memory, no one knows how much later, and then translated into Greek. The books that contain these Greek sayings of Jesus differ in many respects; and violent have been the methods whereby the harmonists of older days have wrested these scriptures to make them agree. In this long process a mechanical infallibility has small chance of survival. We may find later that here too we have to be content with inspiration; and perhaps we shall recognise ultimately that we have made not a bad exchange.

---

[1] John viii. 25 R.V. text and margin respectively.

There are not a few people who would put up another claimant to infallibility. The Pope has gone, and the Book, and now Science reigns in their stead. This kind of assumption lies at the root of the prevalent denials of miracle. ‘Miracles do not happen,’ said Matthew Arnold; and no Pope ever spoke *ex cathedra* with a more infallible air. Well, we shall see. There are not wanting signs, for those who have courage and insight, that some of the flat denials of yesterday may become cautious admissions of to-morrow, and perhaps even confident dogmas in some near future: what the as yet unexplored spiritual forces of the world may be able to do even with the material universe in which they are placed, we may come to understand far more than we do just now. But if fervent dogmatists who profess to speak for Science claim for her the infallibility they deny to other voices, it will be well to recall the rapidity with which great scientific theories change and pass. They give immense impetus to the advance of knowledge, and in many things permanently enlarge our outlook, but they develop into new forms with new discovery, and their assertions may in a generation cease to disturb theologians who found them hard to fit into an ordered system of thought. It is in the essence of science to be eternally forgetting the things that are behind and reaching forward to the things that are before; and no truly scientific spirit would ever claim infallibility for our knowledge in any sphere that can possibly touch our inquiries into the great mysteries of God and His relation with the world. 'Exact sciences' there are, whose results must be taken as permanent and assured in every way. But these are just the sciences that never can come into real contact with the problems of religion. In the rest of the sciences, just as in conduct and in religious theory, Probability and not Infallibility rules with indisputable sway.[1]

If I have in this lecture done the needful destructive work according to the right method, I have already laid the foundations of my reconstruction. 'The Infallibilities are gone!' and I repeat the saying as a Christian apologist, not with the tremor of doubt and disillusionment, but with the exultation of a liberated prisoner, the enthusiasm of a new and quenchless hope. For if it is God's hand that has snatched away these trusted pillars of our faith, if it be His will that the powers on which we leaned so confidingly should fail us one by one, we may surely comfort ourselves with the reflection that He must have the best of reasons. He could only take away these seeming necessaries because they are capable of being replaced with something better. The things that are shaken are being removed, as things that are made, only that what is not shaken may remain. A really robust faith might even stop here, and declare that the destructive forces, over which timid good men are mourning, must after all be from God, from whom all skill and science flow. It is He who planted in the human mind alike the insatiable thirst for knowledge and the wonderful powers which can satisfy it. Truth is no malignant demon; she is the very daughter of the voice of God. And if the stern and unmistakable call of Truth bids us follow into the wilderness, or forfeit our intellectual honesty and play the traitor to our conscience, surely we may infer that the path to the Celestial City lies there. A Greater than we was led by the Spirit, not once only, into the wilderness, and we can safely follow. For Truth, we know, can make the desert blossom as the rose; while the fruitful land must certainly be turned into a wilderness when they who dwell therein have become unfaithful to the trust they had from God. If we could see no reason whatever for this shattering of infallibilities, we should still say to Truth, 'If thou leadest, I follow'; and the following of faith that rests on what is most surely known of the very nature of God would be blessed in the latter end.

---

[1] If it is objected that this rules out certainty in morals and in religion, I reply that 'mathematical certainty' leaves no sphere for conscience. Probability includes all the great truths which are certainties to every healthy mind as such.

But I venture to declare that we are not left to follow blindly. Some most satisfying reasons can be given for the removal of that which we used to think so essential to spiritual peace. We are accustomed to assume that Truth can only be *one*. The 'lovelie lady' who 'rode faire bisyde' the Redcross Knight of Spenser's allegory was rightly named Una; and our deepest instincts tell us that the Unity of Truth is as vital a doctrine as the Unity of God. And yet, after all, do we not cherish the doctrine of a Trinity that does not belie the eternal Unity, but only serves to bring it nearer to us? Let us venture on a homely illustration. Truth is the food of the soul—and this is not a 'mere' parable, a figure of speech, a fanciful comparison; it is one of the innumerable examples of continuity between the provinces of God's world. Now 'food' is a general word that covers an immense number of very different species. And in reference to any of them we have two questions to ask when we come to the practical application. We ask first, 'Is this food *good in itself* ?' And then we ask, 'Is it good *for me* ?' One man's meat is proverbially another man's poison. Milk, eggs, oatmeal, and other pre-eminently wholesome foods may be absolutely forbidden by our doctor when we are in certain conditions of health; while things that are generally regarded as highly indigestible may be for some people actually the best nutriment they can take. 'Food,' then, is a relative term: we must find out what suits us best and keep to it, and its results in keeping the body thoroughly efficient for its work will be a joint function of its intrinsic excellence and its suitability to our individual constitution. And the principle which we thus recognise for the body is no less true for the soul. There is a kind of truth which we instinctively recognise as the food of our higher life; and of this we shall always find that it is essentially relative, not absolute. Truths there are, myriads of them, as to which no question is possible when once they are discovered. That the earth is round and not flat—that two sides of a triangle are together longer than the third side—that prussic acid is poisonous—these are truths which are indisputable now, even though there were times when men did not know them. It is nearly the same with historical questions and questions of literary criticism. Some ingenious sceptic may try to disprove the fact that Julius Caesar was assassinated on March 15, 44 B.C. He may succeed or he may fail; but the *truth* must be either yes or no, and the fact cannot vary according to the mental conditions of people who examine it. But such truths as this are not truths that feed us. We know what sort of truth concerns conduct, what really matters to us when we are trying to live a right life. We find daily strength and comfort in some great doctrine of religion. And then we read for ourselves and discover that men better than we doubt or deny what is literally vital to us. What are we to say? 'I am *right*, and every one who differs is as absolutely *wrong* as if he said that two and two make five.' Do we not see that this all too familiar attitude only means the recognition of a whole world of contradictory infallibilities? No two thinking men would be found to agree perfectly on every great doctrine of religion. If, then, whosoever would be saved must before all things agree with one cast-iron creed, the Heavenly Father has indeed strangely constituted the minds of His children whom He would fain bring to a knowledge of Himself!

No, Truth for us must clearly be diverse, however truly one. The analogy of Nature tells us this unmistakably. There is no speech nor language, its voice cannot be heard, and yet every blade of grass has its parable if only our ears be open. Nature has no duplicates. The oak-tree is the same tree wherever we meet it, and yet no two oak-trees are alike. Machine-made uniformity is man's ideal, not God's. It is according to Nature—and Nature means only the will of God in creation—that the same one Truth should come to each of us in a different form.

And there is something else more vital still. We think it is supremely important to *find* Truth, and we are heartbroken, it may be, because we seem to see that no blessed certainty will reward our passionate striving. Believe me, it is the *seeking* of Truth that is the supreme necessity for you and me. The palm without the dust is no ambition for the runner in this race. Truth ready-made, coming to us like a suit of clothes from the tailor, is a poor thing indeed, however faultlessly shaped it may be. Tennyson was perfectly right in those well-worn words—well-worn just because they are so true:—

> There lives more faith in honest doubt,
> Believe me, than in half the creeds.

For a creed that only represents some one else's thinking cannot have moral worth to me, like a blundering system I have thought out for myself. I may be all wrong, but I have given my soul to the search, and God will surely lead me out of my blunders by the further exercise of the same labour of the soul. And if I am unfitted by the narrowness of my gifts and my necessary preoccupation with daily toil for meddling with high matters, I am to take in what I can and strive for more. The effect of it all upon the worth of my life to the world in which God has placed me will depend partly on the intrinsic value of the truths that I believe, but far more on the intensity with which I believe it and the earnestness with which I seek for more light.

Are we never then to see the final solution of all our problems ? Will the world go on for ages debating as of old the great doctrines about God and His dealings with men ? Listen to the answer in some of the grandest words that our English tongue was ever permitted to frame :—

> The One remains, the many change and pass ;
> Heaven's light for ever shines, Earth's shadows fly ;
> Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
> Stains the white radiance of Eternity,
> Until Death tramples it to fragments.

It may be only the greatest of all Probables that the key to every problem of belief lies on the other side of our last change. But all our instincts speak for it. Something tells us, and we seem to know it for a word of God, that if we launch out without fear upon the darkening sea we shall meet our Pilot there.

We learned in earlier years the mathematical doctrine of parallel straight lines. Here are two lines that are a yard apart as I touch them. Prolong them to the end of this room, they will still be a yard apart, no more and no less. Go on with them—on a mile—a thousand miles—on to the distance of the sun—to the distance of the farthest star we can see—they will be exactly a yard apart there. 'They will never meet,' is one way of putting it. 'They meet at infinity,' is another. Even so with contradictory truths, as they seem to us who eagerly argue over them. 'They will never meet,' we say in our despair. Nay, they too will meet at Infinity—they will be reconciled in God.

LECTURE II

HOW STANDS THE BIBLE?

FORCES OF DISINTEGRATION

In my last lecture I made a beginning with the profoundly important subject which is to occupy us to-night and when we meet next. No one will think that we are giving disproportionate attention to a single subject, when that subject is the Bible. We saw reason to question the old view that the Bible was infallible, and preferred to regard it as inspired. If it is—and even if it were not—it must necessarily take an overwhelmingly predominant place in any discussion of the modern case for Christianity. For though we have abandoned claims which the Bible does not make for itself, though we shall even realise before we have finished that the Bible is not itself the centre of the Christian religion, it remains of necessity the road by which we must reach that centre. And we are bound, therefore, to concentrate a large part of our attention upon this Book, asking what kind of influence the modern spirit has had upon the position of the Bible in human thought.

Now even those who are ready to go with me as far as I went last night, well many of them perhaps have been conscious of a certain uneasiness as to modern criticism and its dealings with the Bible. Every one seems agreed that there is an immense difference between to-day's view of the Scriptures and that which prevailed fifty years ago. Unitarians declare that even they have changed; they used to prove out of Scripture their fundamental doctrine as to the Person of Christ, and now they do not care to take the trouble—they have cut loose from the Book's authority. But they declare that though they have changed much, we have changed more. Is that really true ? And if it is, are we to admit to ourselves that we have witnessed the permanent dethronement of the majestic literature that once reigned with unquestioned sovranty over the minds and consciences of men ?

You will hardly be doubtful that my answer to this last question is a most emphatic No. But I do not mind conceding to the Unitarians the reality of the change in which they find so much satisfaction. Indeed I am not sure that my satisfaction is not quite as lively as theirs. It is just because our views of the Bible have altered so greatly that we hold to-day an impregnable position upon the great truth for which the Evangelical Free Churches witness as the essence of their message. That being so, we may very cheerfully give the Unitarians credit for being among the pioneers in a movement in which they have done some of the work and we have reaped most of the fruits. They have only been illustrating the profound truth of a great saying of Bishop Westcott, who told of his own early resolve to treat the Bible in his studies just like any other book ; it was this method, he said, that led him to realise that it was not like any other book. Even so we have reason to be grateful to all earnest workers, of whatever school, who have helped to strip off tawdry finery and let the Bible stand forth unadorned save with its own beauty and power.

We may review very briefly the main forces that have brought about the change described. First, in order of time will come the wonderful developments of physical science which culminated fifty years ago in Darwin's formulation of the doctrine of Evolution. Science contradicted the supposed evidence of Genesis rather sharply, and the world was for years divided between the rival cries, 'So much the worse for Science!' and 'So much the worse for Genesis!'

This particular phase of the controversy has mostly vanished, but there are others which have grown acuter with time. Every fresh scientific discovery has been a new revelation of the universal reign of Law. And the Bible contains miracles, which always at least seem to violate the great principle that gives the man of science his very foundation. It can hardly be wondered at when men whose whole souls have been captured by the majestic thought of that which 'preserves the stars from wrong' revolt against apparent violation of natural law. We cannot stay here to discuss the validity of the prejudices which have worked against the authority of the Bible in the modern mind, our business just now is only to record them. Enough if we simply point out that something more vital than even natural law is outraged when men cannot see the difference between the healing miracles of Jesus and Livy's stories of Attius Navius and his razor, or the stone Juno that shook its head in the temple at Veii.

Physical science, however, is not the only science that has had its say about the contents of the Bible. The 'wonderful century' that we have lately left behind brought the scientific spirit and method into all fields of human knowledge alike, and into history as much as any of them. A large part of the Bible bears the form of history; and scientific research, trained to examine and compare and weigh the records of the past, could not be false to all its principles because well-meaning churchmen tried to brandish the flaming sword of the cherubim to bar the way of trespassers on holy ground. Not only were there records of miracle in the Bible, which the historian felt bound to criticise as he would criticise similar records in other literature. There were historical statements there which appeared to contravene other statements found in the Bible itself, or in inscriptions or documents elsewhere accessible. The net result was to set a large part of the Bible among the historian's first-class authorities in that respect, but no higher than some others which he consulted, and certainly not on any plane of sacrosanct infallibility.

Next comes a science of more recent birth, of which in these days we hear most of all from fervent but untrained defenders of Biblical Revelation. Like other fields of knowledge, but later than most of them, the internal and external history of ancient books came under the sway of scientific methods. It became impossible to take on trust some old tradition as to the authorship of a book, or to accept without inquiry the form of that book as it came from copies written many centuries after the author's day. Traditional date, authorship, or text might prove to be sound enough, but rigid inquiry must be made, and if the results were unfavourable to tradition, the lover of truth must not shut his eyes. To this science was given very properly the name of criticism. The word is a metaphor from the court of law, as we generally use it, it comes nearest to the function of the advocate, the counsel for the prosecution, whose business it is to make out a case for the side on which he has been briefed. But that is not the etymological or the legitimate meaning of the word. 'Criticism' is the function of the *judge*,[1] whose supreme business it is to find out the truth, his right to sit in judgment being vitiated as soon as he allows the slightest bias on either side to invade his mind. 'Biblical Criticism,' then, is the science which impartially labours to find out the truth as to the literary history of the books of the Bible. There are divers courts, and the cases are many and of great complexity; and as judges are but fallible men, it will naturally be found that verdicts differ. Even in the Court of Appeal, where sit the most highly-trained and capable scholars, it will often be found that critics will dissent from their brethren; and for reasons which I tried to state in my first lecture, there is here no House of Lords to give an infallible judgment against which (right or wrong) there is no appeal.

---

[1] Greek *kritēs*=a judge.

Since this part of my subject raises peculiar misunderstandings among Christians who have not yet got over their resentment against such sacred matters being taken into court at all, I must pause here a little longer for explanation of terms. Much prejudice has been raised by the misunderstanding of the word ‘Criticism,’ which is, as we have seen, limited to the impartial investigation that may end in a verdict for either side. Perhaps even more has been roused by the adjective ‘Higher,’ against which much futile scorn has been levelled by advocates ignorant of its meaning, including not a few who have no excuse whatever for being ignorant. Biblical Criticism (like that of other books) is divided into three branches. ‘Lower’ Criticism, now generally called ‘Textual,’ concerns itself with the question whether we have a book in the form in which it was first published: how far have mistakes crept in during its successive multiplications by the hands of scribes in the ages of its later history? ‘Higher’ Criticism takes up the investigation at a point higher up the stream: it asks who wrote the book, and when, and what were the sources from which the author drew. The arrogance which has been discovered in the phrase ‘Higher Criticism’ is a pure figment, due to mere accidents of language, but ‘Literary Criticism’ would, no doubt, be a better name to use. Of the third branch, ‘Historical’ Criticism, I have spoken already. The mere definition of these terms is enough to show that in all this we move in a sphere which must be mainly left to the experts. This will probably be a rather unwelcome assertion to some; let me, therefore, pause a moment to prove it by an illustration, and then show why we can leave this field to the experts without feeling that we are surrendering to other people the preservation or destruction of that which is of vital concern to us. I will only mention one among many reasons why Biblical Criticism must be committed to the experts. I might enlarge upon general reasons. We who are not trained geologists cannot conceivably argue for or against the assertion of a scientific authority who says that human life on this earth begins at a distance of so many millennia ago. We should simply make ourselves ridiculous by entering the discussion. The expert may be wrong, but it is only his fellow-experts who can convict him. Similarly I might show it is absurd for those who do not even know the original languages of the Bible to discuss assertions of critical science which depend entirely on facts drawn from the study of those languages. Let me illustrate from an event in our own literary history. You remember how Chatterton wrote poems which he pretended he had found in a collection of old English documents. He took in the people of his own time completely, for it was an uncritical age, and both the poet himself and his readers were incapable of seeing what differences there were between the English of Chaucer and this which tried to imitate it. Only the scientific knowledge of our own time could show up finally the mistakes which proved that the Rowley Poems were not and could not have been written in the period to which they were attributed. Imagine a modern Englishman, who had never learnt the grammar of English as it was five centuries ago, undertaking to prove that Chatterton's fiction was fact, and his pseudo-antique poems really dated from a period long before his day! But this would be reason itself compared with the effort of a person who cannot read Hebrew to defend or attack an assertion about the date of Genesis which depends largely on phenomena of language not unlike those I have just referred to in my illustration. Of course there are many critical arguments which can be appreciated quite as well by the English reader as by the Hebraist, but I have dealt with one kind only as a sample. Now in the matter of Old Testament criticism I come before you entirely as an amateur. Perhaps I may help you all the better for that, for I can explain how I apply to this field in which I am no expert the lessons I have learnt from the study of critical science elsewhere. In the Old Testament I do not feel I can give a first-hand judgment. My time is too full to leave me leisure for Semitic study, or for the reading of German or English monographs upon the complex problems that confront the Old Testament scholar. What do I do then ? How am I going to form an intelligent opinion upon subjects on which I am to speak to you this very evening ? Well, my instinct tells me to trust the experts. I can see very well how they stand as a whole. I know that there are a relatively small number on the two opposite wings who go far beyond the mass of their fellow-craftsmen, some in the direction of what seems reckless innovation and some in an obstinate defence of old fashioned views. But the men who carry most weight with the world of scholarship stand together in a middle position and agree on all really important matters to a surprising extent. Is it not reasonable that I should argue thus ? 'I cannot venture on an independent judgment : to do so I should need an equipment for the gaining of which I have neither gifts nor time. But I can see that the great majority of the best authorities are agreed upon positions that differ very widely indeed from those which were accepted unquestioningly in John Wesley's day. Is it not my wisdom to go back upon fundamentals, and ask myself whether the accepted results of Old Testament criticism really do involve the surrender of what is vital to my faith ? For if my faith is going to depend upon my being able to refute the mass of those who know most about these highly technical subjects, surely my faith must be resting on a very insecure foundation.' In arguing thus I am simply applying to another science the argument which Christians began to apply to the discoveries of biology as soon as the shock of the doctrine of

Evolution gave them calmness enough to stop and think. What has been the result? There is hardly a Christian thinker now who does not accept from the experts in physical science all the light which fifty years have brought under the leadership of Darwin's great idea; and we have only found faith entrenched more strongly than ever, with a profounder doctrine of God than was possible in the older day. Even so, we are already finding more and more that the new science of criticism is going to enrich and not destroy. But I am anticipating what is in fact to be the thesis I shall expand when I deal more in detail with the two great divisions of our Bible; and I am not yet quite ready to leave the general survey.

For there is in fact yet another disintegrating force, a science much younger than criticism, of which we have only begun to hear much during the last few years. As is usual with new sciences, it has not a few noisy advocates who are quite sure that it holds the keys of all the mysteries. Not for the first or the hundredth time, we are told that a gun has been forged which is to shatter the old walls of Christian faith beyond possibility of repair. These confident announcements have not produced so much dismay among the more timid defenders as some that have been published in former days. In fact there are a good many of us who have a shrewd idea that the gun can be captured and made to do great execution when placed in position within the fortress. The science of Comparative Religion is a conspicuous result of the new outlook created by the doctrine of Evolution. If 'the proper study of mankind is man,' clearly the beliefs and institutions of man are a fit subject for scientific inquiry, and even the lowest and most savage of them merit impartial critical investigation by students who set themselves to collect and interpret the facts. If the body of an earthworm is held deserving of a monograph by a supremely great man of science, it is presumably right to devote equally earnest and scientific attention to the products of the mind of man. Now this elevation of religions, savage or cultured, ridiculous or rational, into a subject of pure research—research which must start by renouncing the question as to whether the religion examined is true—has many obvious consequences for the friends and the foes of the Bible. We collect 'Sacred Books of the East' and fill fifty goodly volumes with critical English versions of them. But the Bible is a library of 'sacred books of the East.' What is the relation between the new library and the old ? The study of these newly accessible books reveals a great many features that are common to them and to the Bible in one part or another. The study of more rudimentary religions—the rites and usages of savages whose religion never had a written form—shows everywhere phenomena with which we were familiar in the religious history of Israel. What is the inference ? Why, of course, people say that the uniqueness of the Bible is gone. It is simply one collection of sacred books which stands by the books of the Buddhist canon or the hymns and the codes of the Parsi Avesta as a valuable monument of antiquity, deserving the same detached and impartial study that we give to them. Israel has no monopoly of revelation. In fact—so the argument will proceed—Revelation itself is an old-fashioned word, for we are now able to see by comparative methods how religious ideas arise and how they grow. Religion was not *revealed*, any more than man was fashioned in a day by an act of special creation. Evolution accounts for his body and presumably his mind—it accounts for his spirit too, if indeed we can use such a word any longer.

Now this new disintegrating force which I have described in a few sentences makes much too big a subject for me to deal with it here.[1] I will content myself with referring to one central principle of the science which emerges from the study of the writings of its famous exponent, the great Cambridge scholar, Dr. J. G. Frazer, now Professor in your Liverpool University. In that epoch-making book of his, *The Golden Bough*, Professor Frazer examines an endless succession of rites and beliefs belonging to ancient and modern peoples in every stage of culture. The similarity of these to one another is always astonishing us as we read. An idea or a usage will be described, the very absurdity of which to our eyes makes us confident that it can only have been current among savages in some corner of the world, untouched by influences from outside. And lo! it proves to be wellnigh universal. There it is among the aborigines of Australia and the Red Indians of Canada. Something essentially identical is subsequently recognised among the ancient Athenians and the modern Hindus. It was discovered by the Spaniards when they entered Mexico, and it belongs to the State religion of Japan. And perhaps the tale is completed by its recognition as an uneradicated popular superstition, the understanding of which is necessary to expound some text in the Old Testament. What does it all mean? Was it a notion that has survived from the days when mankind was limited to one small community, living together in one place? Not so. Professor Frazer and all the experts are clear enough about it. The human mind is much the same everywhere, and similar conditions produce similar results. So much we can assert as cold, impartial students of the science of religion. It is not our business as such to ask what is the value of some idea that proves wellnigh universal in primitive mankind; we are only concerned to define it and to interpret it if we can. But when the Christian theologian comes to study the results that comparative religion puts into his hands,

---

[1] Perhaps for the present I may venture to refer to two popular discussions of it in my contributions to the Manchester Central Hall Lectures, entitled, *Is Christianity True ?* (Methodist Publishing

---

House, 1904), and *The Religious Doubts of Democracy* (Macmillan, 1904). I hope to be returning to the problem before very long.

what inference does he draw? Surely nothing less than this, that there is something in the very constitution of the human mind which makes religious conceptions inevitable. So that the idea of God comes in the necessary course of Evolution. And if Evolution simply means what we can discover of the methods of God as Creator, we have no reason to rebel against the doctrine. God made man and appointed his conditions, that he should seek God as instinctively as he seeks his food. When the Christian thinker is confronted with the sciolist's airy dogma that the Bible is only one of many sacred books of the East, he has an easy reply. *Tolle, lege,* he says—go and *read* the 'Sacred Books of the East,' and then come back and talk such nonsense if you can. But he himself has no contempt for all these gropings after God. They only prove that God is not far from any of His children, and that Truth has a marvellous power to feed even when it is diluted with a terrible amount of what more privileged believers know to be mere chaff. Christianity thus becomes the great synthesis, the culminating truth that brings together all the partial truths and the broken lights that man has been helped by the indwelling God to achieve. So the newest of the supposed disintegrating forces, like all the others in their turn, is seen to have torn asunder only that God's own hand may join together in a new and diviner way.

LECTURE III

HOW STANDS THE BIBLE?

THE OLD TESTAMENT

So far we have been dealing with the general considerations which affect the estimate of the Bible as a whole. We come now to ask how the knowledge of to-day has altered our reading of the Scriptures of the Hebrew Canon. Are they ‘ Scripture ’ still ?

It all depends on what we mean by ‘ Scripture.’ I need not repeat what I said in the first lecture about Infallibility, but it will be well to apply it. Put aside the question whether we can *believe* all that is presented to us as science, as history, in various Old Testament Books. It is more important for us to ask whether we can prove it. The man in the street to-day knows that a majority of the most learned and devout scholars in Old Testament subjects are in favour of dates which make the records inadequate, to his thinking, as evidence of events antecedently improbable. If the oldest narratives of the Pentateuch do not date beyond the eighth century B.C., how can they be evidence for the marvels told in connection with the work of Moses—not to speak of events assigned to the earliest ages of human history ? If the Book of Daniel belongs to the age of the Maccabees, what is the use of quoting it to prove that three young Hebrew courtiers of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, some five centuries before, were thrown into a burning fiery furnace and came out safe and sound ? Now I am not going to stop and ask whether these stories *can* be defended as veritable history. For my present purpose it is enough to say that it is quite impossible to prove it to the satisfaction of the modern man. That may if you like only show how sceptical, materialist, unspiritual, the modern man has become. But I think it is clear that what we may without prejudice call old-fashioned views of the Old Testament are a very powerful hindrance when Christian teachers try to bring religion near to the hearts and consciences of men. The biggest, most carefully organised, and most prolonged evangelistic campaign of recent years was by general consent a failure. It did very much good, of course, but it left behind it no permanent results such as after nearly thirty years still forbid our forgetting the missions of D. L. Moody. Am I wrong in saying that one of the most conspicuous causes of this failure was Dr. Torrey's fervent championship of a view of the Bible which the modern man regards as obsolete ? You may think Dr. Torrey's creed a creed of to-morrow, and not only a creed of yesterday. The fact remains that it is not the creed of to-day, and that it is hardly possible to find either a scholar or a Christian leader who would subscribe to his whole-hearted denunciations of the modernism he thought so traitorous to the faith.

Now, of course, if Dr. Torrey is right, and the truth of Christ is really undermined by these views of His modern followers, we must try to shoulder the burden as well as we can, and persuade the modern man that if he would be saved he must before all things hold the 'obsolete' doctrines pure and undefiled. But as we do not want to tie our hands unnecessarily, when in the thick of a life-and-death struggle with forces of selfishness and degradation and sin, we ought not to make up our minds without very earnest and open-minded thought. May I venture then to put before you what I may call a modern view of the Old Testament, that you may see whether it really belittles the unique importance of that Revelation, or endangers the convictions which are dearest to a Christian heart ?

If I were to put into one word what I call a modern view of the Old Testament Canon, I should say it is before all things *representative*. Its inclusions and its exclusions owe little enough to the sanction of a body of Rabbis or a Council of Bishops. No 'infallibility of the odd man' determined for us that Ecclesiastes should go in and Ecclesiasticus stand outside the circle of writings which should be venerated as of Divine authority. It was historically a survival of the fittest, not essentially unlike the processes which have selected certain works out of the literary output of seventeenth century England as classics, leaving the rest to oblivion. The Books which became canonical were those which the religious Jews of Palestine *read*, and they read them because they instinctively felt them to be representative of their religion from various sides. Their brethren of the Dispersion, whose Bible was in Greek, added to them certain other Books, which we call the Apocrypha. The stricter Jews of Palestine rejected them. We do not follow their decisions because we agree with their instinct. For us the Book of Wisdom, which passionately preaches immortality, does not in this respect stand lower than Ecclesiastes, which denies it. But since Jesus came not to destroy but to fulfil, since Christianity is avowedly a step upwards from Judaism, and the first Christian preachers started with the presuppositions of Jews, we cannot properly understand Christianity without an all-round understanding of the Judaism from which it sprang. The representative Books, therefore, of Palestine are indispensable.

Let us apply this to some typical parts of the Old Testament. What of the chapters of Genesis that lead up to the call of Abraham? Are they fact or folklore? Cuneiform research—one of the most astonishing intellectual triumphs of the nineteenth century—has unearthed and deciphered Assyrian tablets that tell (for example) the story of the Flood in almost the same language, but on frankly polytheistic lines. Perhaps we hesitate to adopt the inference that such stories are folklore, the value of which for us lies in the fact that they formed the basis of all Jewish thought and therefore of the Apostles' preaching—nor less in the marvellous manner in which these old Jewish writers made the folk-story the medium for conveying their own sublime monotheism. Our hesitation will perhaps be lessened by reflection on the heavy burden science compels us to recognise in the narratives as they stand. If our theory of inspiration forces us to take these chapters as an infallible record of Creation and the early history of man, how grievously must those records be wrested to make them agree with what science tells us now ! It is not for me to speak on the scientific value of the innumerable ' reconciliations ' of Genesis and science. I only note the desperate shifts of interpretation which most of them involve ; and I bid you observe also that even if they be wholly on right lines, the modern man has palpably lost interest in them. You will never re-establish in this way the old view of the Bible as a handbook of science. Take one point as an example, the antiquity of man on the earth. It is no longer any use to plead that Ussher's chronology is no part of the inspired Word. Of course it is not, and yet in its broad features it is a necessary deduction from it. There is no room for bringing in dropped links in the chain ; and nothing can alter the fact that Methuselah and others are allowed to live to an age indefinitely beyond the utmost limit that science or history can recognise. It is futile to point to differences between the figures in the Hebrew, the Septuagint Greek, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. They all agree on a longevity which is utterly impossible according to scientific authority. Nor can we get out of the difficulty by hypothetical interpretations, of which there are not a few, involving, as they do, a reading of the Word which makes it nothing better than an ancient enigma rather than a Divine revelation. How much better to acknowledge that we have here an old traditional story duly recorded as familiar to every Israelite child, which takes its place in the story of the foundations of Israel's belief! If Jesus could use fiction—for what else is parable in most cases?—why could not His forerunners use folklore for a similar purpose, the conveying of religious truth?

I pass on to another typical Old Testament difficulty, which we have to meet in a different way. How serious a stumbling-block is the Book of Jonah to the modern man! Its marvels seem to him simply grotesque, and they are made all the more so when he hears of the amazing discoveries whereby old-fashioned believers used to prove the events to have been almost ordinary occurrences. The result is that a book which a great missionary advocate once described as the finest foreign missions tract ever written, has degenerated in men's minds into 'something about a whale.' Modern criticism has restored this great little book to its rightful place near the very summit of Old Testament prophecy. This time it is scientific *interpretation*, which has examined the book in the light of other Jewish literature and concluded that the author was allegorising.

Our difficulties have been due simply to the loss of the key. As soon as we have ceased to take the book literally, we are free to grasp its sublimely universalist outlook. He was a great prophet indeed, a man wonderfully gifted with inspired insight, who could forget all his national prejudices and portray the yearning love of God for Israel's bitterest foes!

The immense gain that comes to our understanding of the Old Testament by thus recognising the presence of systematic allegory in Jonah would be clear to every Christian, but for one serious difficulty. It is really anticipating the next section to deal with it now, but I need make no apology for keeping together the questions that arise out of this little book. It will be an advantage, moreover, to take early a point which raises an important principle of criticism applied to the Bible. The allegorical view of Jonah is supposed to be put out of court by our Lord's witness (Matt. xii. 40), in which He compared His own sojourn in the grave to Jonah's three days and three nights in the whale's belly.

Now there are some considerations which we have already advanced that might very well be applied here. It is clear that our plea for the *reality* of the Lord's Manhood is concerned. No knowledge of the real meaning of Jonah could have come to Him which His contemporaries did not possess, unless we are bound to regard the matter as one of such vital moment that a Teacher sent from God could not fail to have special enlightenment thereon. And that is hard to believe, when, as we have seen, He shows elsewhere no sign of scientific knowledge about the Bible other than that which was current among His countrymen. Everywhere His penetration into Scripture is purely spiritual—a grasp of the great religious principles of Revelation and a power to apply them in detail so that the lessons He draws can never be rendered obsolete by any discovery that criticism has made or can make. Even here we may soon see that the words hold perfectly well whether Jonah is history or allegory : Jonah *in the book* spends three days and nights in the whale's belly, and our sentence from the Gospel speaks of nothing more. There would be nothing strange if a preacher were to say that Hugh Latimer ascended to heaven from the blazing pyre 'as Faithful ascended in a chariot of fire from Vanity Fair '—though Faithful is only a hero of religious fiction !

These alternative methods of dealing with a difficulty will serve as examples to be used at other times ; but on this occasion they must probably yield to another which at first sight will be a little startling. Criticism tells us rather confidently—even through such conservative scholars as Professor Sanday—that

Jesus never said the words in question. The 'sign of Jonah' in Luke's Gospel, and in the whole context of the passage in Matthew, is something totally different. Jonah's whale was not the sign to the Ninevites. I believe there have been apologists in an earlier day who made the whale circumnavigate Africa and disgorge the prophet somewhere up the Tigris. We are none of us quite robust enough in our faith for this solution ; and, failing this, we are forced to accept the interpretation to which any intelligent reader of Luke is bound—that it is Jonah's *preaching* which was the 'sign.' Nor is this all. Matt. xii. 40 plainly asserts that the Son of Man should be 'three days *and three nights* in the heart of the earth.' If Jesus died on Friday and rose again on Sunday morning, there were obviously only *two* nights in the grave. The difficulty was felt so strongly by that great scholar Westcott, that in his early work, the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, he argued for Thursday as the day of the Crucifixion. I do not believe he made any converts ; but apart from this there is absolutely no explanation of the discrepancy which does not defy common sense. Now we know that the early Church was extraordinarily alive to possibilities of finding fulfilments of prophecy, even where the most ingenious expositor of modern times would fear to follow. Our general knowledge of the exegetical habits of the early Fathers would justify us in declaring that the appropriateness of Jonah's three days as a prophecy of the Resurrection could not have escaped those acute wits. Some one was sure to write this in his Gospel at the proper place, in spite of its inconsistency with the context and the havoc that it makes in the history of the Passion. We are loath to admit subjective principles into our treatment of the sacred text ; and this particular method of accounting for one or two otherwise insoluble difficulties has been grossly abused by over-ingenious critics, till our unwillingness to use it at all is extreme.

But after all it is not logical to rule out a method merely because it has been abused. And here the difficulty is so serious, in its consequences for the credibility of our sources for the Gospel history, that we cannot wonder when the majority of our most conservative and reverent scholars regard the verse as an early addition to the evangelic tradition, and no true part of the Master's teaching.

But it is time we passed on to other typical difficulties in which our modern Bible-study has its contribution to offer. We have tarried so long over the most conspicuous of them that we must let a few sentences suffice for the rest. I have already hinted at the solution of the problem of Ecclesiastes. How strangely fascinating that book is! It might seem to be peculiarly attractive to the modern mind, which revels in Omar's pessimism, and persuades itself that an outlook of blank nothingness beyond the grave, and sheer fatalism on this side, are right and proper for a wise man with no fond illusions. But how does a Christian read the words of the Preacher as he denies the hereafter in which Christ has taught him to hope? Or what is, if possible, harder still—what can a Christian make of the text which bids him 'be not righteous overmuch'? When faith and fire were dead in English Christianity, we know how that text was thundered out from many a pulpit against the Methodists who were reviving the enthusiasm of the Apostles' days. Were those preachers right? Assuredly no. There is no theory of the Bible which can make us believe that Divine Inspiration sends us the message, 'Be not righteous overmuch,' and only a fallible modern enthusiast makes us sing,

> Too much to Thee I cannot give,
> Too much I cannot do for Thee.

Well, why is Ecclesiastes in the Canon? Because, I say again, the Canon is *representative*. Could we understand Judaism if we knew only the spiritual ancestors of the Pharisees, who gave us the great promise of the last chapter of Daniel, and the superb picture of enthusiasm for righteousness which did not think a burning fiery furnace too high a price to pay? We need to know whence came the Sadducees, for they too had ideals, and a real religion of their own.

There were materialists and worldlings enough among them, no doubt; but there must have been some whose denials sprang from genuine religious conservatism, that refused to receive a too seductive novelty because it seemed to have no justification in the faith once for all delivered to their fathers. That it is good to do with our might all that our hand findeth to do, just because it is our duty and the time is short, is a lesson we need to learn still; and if it stands amid many doctrines that we know to be only half-truths at best, can we not hear a Voice that rings all through the Old Testament, and seldom so clearly as here, 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you . . .?'

But if we are to listen for that Voice before we can seize the inspiration of Ecclesiastes, what shall we say of one more feature of Old Testament Scripture—the awful Psalms like that which praised him who should dash the little ones of Babylon against the rocks, or the appalling pages of Esther where the name of God is never heard, and blind vindictive hate holds carnival unrestrained? Well, we may keep to our 'representative' formula still. Scripture always paints its heroes, whether individuals or nations, 'with the warts'; no false idealism keeps out of the Book the fact that its characters were men of like passions with ourselves. And that the children of Israel are good haters is written on all the pages of their history. A little exercise of historical imagination will call up the provocation that produced the Imprecatory Psalms. Should not we find it hard to repress such sentiments ourselves if we lived in Russia to-day, whenever we looked at the palaces where murder and rapine and lust sit enthroned, while truth and patriotism are for ever on the scaffold, and good men cry 'Lord, how long' ? And as to Esther—was not Purim a great popular festival in our Lord's own day ? Nay, do not authorities of commanding influence even tell us that He was made the victim of this very festival, and mocked and sacrificed in the character of Haman? [1] Yes, we need to understand Purim. We need to see how slowly the idea of forgiveness penetrated 'that than which what 's harder ? '—the 'Jewish heart' of the ordinary man. We do not like to read in Proverbs that we are not to exult too fiercely over an enemy's disaster, lest Jehovah see it and turn away His anger from him. But, after all, such ideas only enhance the miracle of grace which produced the sublime counsels of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.[2] And they help us as nothing else can to realise what it means when we hear that Galilean Carpenter cry, as the nails tear their way through His hands, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

There are many more of these typical Old Testament problems on which I should like to linger, but these will be enough to make our principles clear. I want you to understand that modern criticism has not only cleared away difficulties which in former days caused very many to make shipwreck of the faith. It has helped us to grasp the methods of the Divine education of Israel, as God's missionary nation. We do not teach our children the alphabet and the differential calculus simultaneously. And the Divine Teacher did not give to Israel in the days of the Judges the lessons which are enshrined in the fifty-third chapter of

---

[1] See J. G. Frazer's famous chapter in the *Golden Bough*. Of course I do not mean to imply that the theory is proved, nor does Dr. Frazer.

[2] Dr. R. H. Charles dealt with this subject very impressively at the Congress of Religions at Oxford, 1908 : see the *Transactions*, vol. i. p. 305.

Isaiah, or the thirty-first of Jeremiah. ‘Line upon line, precept upon precept,’ He gave them, ‘here a little and there a little,’ till they arrived at spiritual manhood, and were capable of understanding what Jesus came to tell. And this great thought of the Divine education helps us also to surmount the perplexity of Israel’s place among the nations. We must have felt the bewilderment of doctrines not far removed from the conviction of Jews in our Lord’s day that Israel was the Divine favourite, a chosen people dowered with God’s exclusive regard, the sole recipient of Divine revelation, while other nations had to subsist on the crumbs that fell from the children’s table. How could the All-Father leave the vast majority of His children in the outer darkness, and make favourites of one little people who had done nothing to merit such peculiar favour? But now we can see that Israel’s part has been exactly like that played by many another great nation that has brought great gifts to humanity. It has always been God’s way to bless the many through the few. He teaches the most highly gifted that their appointed duty is to ascend on high in order to obtain gifts for men. The fittest survive, but only that they may impart their vitality to others. Men or nations, we receive our ‘talents,’ not for ourselves, but for our fellows’ good. So it was that when God would bring us the precious fruits of intellectual productivity—Art and Science and Literature—He let His great laws of evolutionary development give birth to Athens. When over the chaos of warring nations and anarchic states the blessing of law and government was to be outpoured from on high, the genius of Rome arose to guide the world. When the highest of all gifts was to be brought to the peoples, a nation of peculiar religious genius was fitted for its missionary task by a long process of providential training. Now we do not think of claiming for these great historic nations that they monopolised the gift which they were specially destined to make ready for mankind. Greece produced supremely great religious teachers, and in the theory of government she easily distanced the Romans. Italy could claim Virgil as her son—one of the world's very highest poets, and himself also evidence enough that men could pray to God and teach His will in other languages than Hebrew. And Israel itself had statesmen of whom the world is proud, and masterpieces of pure literature that Greece itself could not surpass. But the primacy in each of these spheres is undisputed. Had the world learnt Art and Science from Rome, Religion from Greece, or Literature from Israel, the treasure of mankind would have been greatly impoverished.

But God would not have left Himself without witness, even though Israel had never been—Socrates and Heraclitus, Euripides and Plato, might have been the prophetic forerunners of a Perfect Man born in some Attic township. The Gospel of the Fatherhood of God would still have gone forth into all the earth. But it would have been far longer and less sure in winning its triumph. Based on a preparation in which the intellect was predominant, rather than the moral and spiritual side of man, the Gospel would have had no such power to grip the hearts of mankind. Sublimely gifted though the Greek prophets were, they never could have appealed to simple folk all over the world as the Hebrew prophets and psalmists have done. And though a Saviour born in Athens would have found His apostles to preach His message, it must have been a message presented with far too much of that 'wisdom' which Paul had to discard even when he preached in Greece itself. For the heart is more than the brain after all, though both are necessary. The part of Greece was coming, and coming very soon ; for Reason needed to be satisfied when the hunger of the soul was appeased. God used the gifts of Israel to teach us religion, those of Greece pre-eminently to teach us theology. That religion is the more important of the two none will question, nor even that it is the only one that is indispensable. But if any one goes on to declare that theology therefore does not matter, we form certain conclusions concerning him, and pass on.

Let me close this lecture with a definite example to show how the world gained by receiving truth through Israel rather than through other nations. How immeasurably has the world been enriched by the coming of the hope of immortality! But it has been no monopoly of Israel. Indeed, the more we study the Old Testament the more clearly we see that the great light does not appear till near the close. Pharisees in our Lord's time exercised their utmost ingenuity to find it in the Books of Moses, and the Sadducees held the field with ease. Yet, many centuries before, Vedic poets had hailed the Dawn as the 'banner of immortality'; and Zoroaster, the Prophet of Iran, had taught how the man of good deeds, good works, and good thoughts should dwell in everlasting peace with the Wise Lord in the House of Song. Israel's saints were still wailing, 'In the grave there is no remembrance of Thee,' when Socrates drank the hemlock, serenely welcoming a blest communion, a fellowship divine, in the world to which he was going, ordering with his last breath a sacrifice to the divine Healer who had stilled for ever the 'fitful fever' of earthly life. How was it that Israel, on the hilltops to catch the first dawn of every other truth, lay so long in the valley of the shadow when God was unfolding the sunshine of His 'living hope' for other men?

The question ceases to perplex when we remember that great paradox of the blessedness of seeking. *How* a truth comes to us is more important even than the character of the truth when it has come. Men achieve the mighty guess in many different ways. Nature-religions, like that of the Veda, impress their followers with the high poetry that is new every morning for those who can read it. For them the daily miracle of dawn spreads in the sky the banner of immortality:—

> So sinks the Daystar in the ocean bed,
> And yet anon repairs his drooping head
> And tricks his beams, and with new-spangled ore
> Flames in the forehead of the morning sky;
> *So* Lycidas . . .

Others come by another road. They meditate on the visions of their dead that have appeared to them in sleep, and they infer the continued existence of those they have thus seen. Others, like Zarathushtra, brood over the wrongs and the inequalities of this life, and their conviction of Justice on the Throne makes them picture a theodicy beyond the gates of the grave. Israel trod none of these ways. The saints and heroes of faith knew no hereafter but that of the nation, no personal immortality save in the life of their children. So long as the nation prospered and Jehovah delivered His people, the Present was rich enough, and good men only asked that God would save His children from Sheol for as long a term as His grace might give. But when darkness and disillusionment came, when exile severed men from the beautiful house of their yearning, when even the return from Babylon only opened a new era of servitude, the promises of God rose into a higher sphere. Personal communion with Him became the one supreme good. His lovingkindness was realised as better than life; in His right hand, and nowhere else, were pleasures for evermore. This new realisation of the preciousness of fellowship with God first added the most poignant terror of all to death. If in Sheol none could give Him thanks, it cut off the pious man from blessings infinitely greater than the worldling ever knew.

But who was He whom the believing soul thus learnt to love so rapturously? 'Take me not away in the midst of my days: Thy years are throughout all generations.' It is the Eternal God that is my refuge, the arms are everlasting that embrace me. Surely if I can say '*my* God' to such a Being, He cannot 'leave the Son of His love to Sheol.' So came the great idea into the heart of Israel's saints. It had come to the brain of Gentile seers long before. But the regenerating hope was not destined to win the world by intellectual conviction. It tarried long, but it was worth waiting for. From the heart of Israel it swept on like a fire to kindle hearts that would never have caught the glow of Reason's creations.

Notice how this account of the rise of the doctrine of immortality in Israel, developed exclusively by the help of criticism and of comparative religion, coincides exactly with the intuition of Jesus. Challenged to prove the Resurrection from the central books of Scripture, He laid His unerring finger on the words that told of God's personal relation with the fathers of their race. *There* lay the warrant of faith. It was no accident that made Israel realise first that God was their own, and only after long ages understand that their souls must therefore partake of His immortality. The former truth was incomparably the more important of the two. Immortality in itself need not be an ethical doctrine at all. Valhalla with its tournaments and its feasting, the Moslem Paradise with its Houris—a mere warrior or sensualist can believe in them and be none the better for his creed. But when a man has learnt the blessedness of communion with a holy God, all life is transfigured for him, and he can do his appointed task here with the light of heaven to illumine his daily path. He can bring the perfect world, to which he looks, down among the homes and haunts of men. A hope of immortality so won, so kept, is the most precious power that ever can be given to lift mankind into the new order where God's will is done. Here is the future as unveiled by Jesus, as pictured in sublimest eloquence by Paul. No unpractical dream, no unreal vision, nerves the best energies of him who has come by way of Hebrew saintship into the heritage bestowed by Christ. 'Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.'

SYNOPTIC STUDIES

I. THE BEATITUDES

THE problem of problems in the synoptic question is the form and contents of the lost Aramaic source which Papias assigns to the Apostle Matthew. Does the First or the Third Gospel preserve it more faithfully? Did the Evangelists study it in Aramaic or in Greek; and if in Greek, had they generally identical translations before them? The studies which follow will have these questions continually in view, though the endeavour to trace the original form of the words of Jesus will only be subsidiary to the endeavour to grasp their essential meaning.

We start with some questions connected with the Sermon on the Mount. It may be as well to say at the outset that this discourse seems to me preserved most closely in Luke vi.: the elements in Matthew v.-vii., which Luke places in other contexts, were not part of the Sermon as it stood in Q—we will adopt this convenient symbol for the non-Marcan source. I may add my own further conviction that where Matthew [1] and Luke differ in their report it is nearly always the former who has been introducing variation. for sundry motives, which will appear as we go on.

In examining the Beatitudes, we may begin with the literary form. It seems almost misleading to use the word 'literary' in connection with such fresh and spontaneous utterances as the words of Jesus. But the Hebrew mind expressed itself in parallelism by a sort of necessity whenever thought was highly charged with feeling; and if the quintessence of 'literature' is simply the best things said in the best way, we can use the term here with small likelihood of being contradicted. We see at once that in Luke vi. 20-26 there is parallelism continuously carried out: each blessing answers exactly to its woe. But a glance at Matthew v. 3-12 shows how much more elaborate is the form. There are eight Beatitudes, followed by a special application of the last; and the eighth lies very near the first. The Kingdom of Heaven is the subject of the Sermon as a whole, and the Beatitudes begin and leave off upon the same appropriate note. They form accordingly when taken together a composition of the same order as the Eighth Psalm—an initial declaration followed by a development, returning upon itself with significant emphasis at the close. That this highly artistic arrangement is due to the Evangelist rather than to his source is made probable by comparing the concluding similitude of the Sermon as it appears in the two Gospels. We may, perhaps, see the same elaboration of parallelism in the Oxyrhynchus Logia. Compare with their canonical parallels the following sayings:—

---

[1] I mean our First Gospel, which probably is 'according to Matthew' because it is so largely 'according to Q.'

I. no. 6. A prophet is not accepted in his own country; *nor doth a physician work cures on them that know him.*

I. no. 7. A city built on the top of a high hill,
and established,
can *neither fall*
nor be hid.

II. no. 4. For there is nothing hid which will not become manifest,
and *buried* which will not [be raised ?].

The parallelism which distinguishes all these new Logia is not without importance as enhancing the probability of a genuine basis for them; but it must be acknowledged as highly likely that they have passed through a medium which has intensified this.

We may now take the Beatitudes in Matthew's order one by one.

1. *Happy the poor in their spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.*

In Luke—

Happy ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

Professor Burkitt points out that the presumed Aramaic original of this ὅτι is ambiguous: it could be equally rendered 'that they . . .' or 'who will . . .' The fact that the two Evangelists translate alike by ὅτι goes to swell the evidence in favour of a common Greek source. The first Beatitude brings us into the heart of our problem, and what we have to say here may be repeated, *mutatis mutandis*, for the two other sayings in which Luke and Matthew come into contrast. Did Matthew insert τῷ πνεύματι, which alters the whole content of the saying; or was it in the source, and did Luke cut it out? A considerable element in our answer is derived from the cumulative effect of studying other similar cases; and if I seem to start with a bias in favour of Luke's originality, it is only fair to note how the bias grew. Here, at any rate, there are arguments independent of other synoptic passages. The paradoxical form of the Lucan Beatitudes speaks strongly for them. The world 'counts the proud happy' (Mal. iii. 15—LXX. μακαρίζομεν), and 'dishonours the poor man' (Jas. ii. 6). In the kingdom of God this judgment is reversed. It is not, of course, that the poor are beatified as such—an allowance of common sense is assumed in the hearers of these pithy paradoxes. The history of the idea needs to be borne in mind. Time was when the flocks and herds of an Abraham or a Job were regarded as the outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace. But the experience of the church-nation after the Exile changed all this. 'Forget not the congregation of Thy poor' was the recurrent cry of the pious, who had only too much reason to make the rich all but synonymous with the wicked (Isa. liii. 9). And so when 'Thy poor' of the Psalmist is taken up in the Master's address to His disciples, we are in no danger of assuming that the blessing on 'you poor' could be readdressed to the drunken casual of to-day. The Lucan form, alike in the absence of τῷ πνεύματι and in the presence of the corresponding Woe, is supported by James, whose saturation in the ideas of the Sermon on the Mount is the one sufficient argument for regarding his Epistle as the work of a Christian Jew. When James says (ii. 5), 'Did not God choose out for Himself the poor as to this world as rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him?' we cannot overlook the direct allusion to our Beatitude. And it must have been in the Lucan form: note the τῷ κόσμῳ (dative of 'person judging,' or possibly not differing much from the εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν of Luke xii. 21) as contrasted with the locative τῷ πνεύματι of Matthew. Nor is this the only allusion in the Epistle. The opening of chapter v. is entirely in the spirit of the Woe here. And in i. 9, 10 we have the element which justifies Matthew's interpretative insertion, 'Let the humble brother glory in his exaltation, and the rich (brother) in his humiliation.' The rich man who, by the grace of Omnipotence, has achieved what is harder than for the camel to pass through the needle's eye, may well glory in that sublime levelling process which enables the millionaire to share with the pauper the treasures of heaven. A further note of Lucan originality may be seen in the characteristic ἀπέχετε of the Woe—'*Alas for you rich, for you have received your consolation.*' It is the technical word in receipts—see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 229, or any page of the second volume of Wilcken's *Ostraka*—and indicates that all that is due has been paid, there is no more to come. The coincidence with Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16 is conclusive. The blessing and the woe together recall many other passages in which the theodicy reverses the conditions of the world: so Isaiah lxv. 13, 14;

Luke i. 52, 53; John xvi. 20, and especially Luke xvi. 25.

The point made above from Luke's use of the second person—the originality of which is supported by its appearance in Matthew v. 11, 12—is not affected by its being found in the Woes as well. The 'disciples' to whom our Lord was speaking included men of all kinds, and all degrees of attachment to His person. He may well have visualised the rich men really or ideally before Him, just as James visualises Sir Gorgius Goldring (ii. 2) stalking into the Christian 'synagogue' amid the fawning servility of the worshippers.

'For yours is the kingdom of God.' Matthew's *τῶν οὐρανῶν* is the obvious substitution of a Jew, which it is unlikely enough that Jesus would countenance by His example,[1] even if He quotes its use by others (Luke xv. 18, 21). The ground of the blessing, as in the other Beatitudes, suits itself exactly to the condition which is pronounced happy. The poor are rich indeed, heirs of a realm of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice, 'a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where thief draws not nigh, nor moth destroyeth.' Happy such poor! poor indeed and miserable they who have already drawn all their treasure, and have no account when too late they would make a draft upon the bank of heaven!

So to no. 2, with which John xvi. 20 has been already compared. *Happy they that mourn, for they will be comforted.*

In Luke—

Happy you that weep now, for you will laugh.

. . . .

Alas (for you), you that laugh now, for you will mourn and weep.

This stands third in Luke's order, and third (but with a different no. 2) in the δ-text of Matthew. An arrangement supported by D and 33 (the 'queen'), the Latins and the Curetonian, with Origen, Clement, and Tertullian, must be treated with respect nowadays; but when the Lewis joins ℵ B and the rest to veto it we can hardly question the ordinary reading. Luke's order is another matter. He makes this Beatitude the second part of the blessing on the hungry. It seems possible that the δ-text reading in Matthew may be harmonistic in its origin, the Beatitudes which are linked in Luke being brought together in Matthew, though the change is not carried far enough to put verse 4 after verse 6. The juxtaposition of *poor* and *meek* would be an additional motive. It may at any rate be said that the Lucan order has nothing against its originality, though there is no decisive argument available.

---

[1] See Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 218; his argument does not seem to me conclusive.

It is difficult to determine between πενθοῦντες and κλαίοντες. On the one hand we have the former word in Isaiah lxi. 2, the great prophecy which formed the text of the Nazareth sermon, and may well be responsible for the blessing on the *poor* coming first here. On the other there is πενθήσετε in the Lucan Woe. It seems that conscious assimilation to Isaiah is the stronger motive, and we regard Luke again as closer to the Greek of Q. That παρακληθήσονται is due to Isaiah can hardly be doubted, so that Luke's γελάσετε is sure. But Matthew's alteration of phraseology, while not affecting the sense, is peculiarly happy in its suggesting an Old Testament reminiscence so characteristic of the Master.

Those of us who are much moved by great music can never forget the magnificent use of this Beatitude in the *Requiem* of Johannes Brahms. The repetition of the same music for the solemn 'Blessed are the dead' at the end is one of the master-strokes which make the *Requiem* heart-searching beyond almost any music ever written.

In the Woe we notice again the echo in James iv. 9, in which every element of the Lucan verse is repeated.

3. *Happy the gentle, for they will inherit the earth.*

This is simply Psalm xxxvii. 11, with the addition of *μακάριοι* and *ὅτι* to bring it into Beatitude form. Its absence from Luke is most easily explained by supposing it foreign to Q at this point, and adapted for its place here by Matthew, either direct from the Psalm, or more probably from a Logion of different form. That *πραΰτης* was beatified by our Lord we know already: see Matthew xi. 29 and 2 Corinthians x. 1—cf. also James iii. 13. We have no adequate equivalent for *πραΰς*. It is unfortunate that the word 'meek' has fallen on evil days. As we use it now, 'meekness' could not fairly be called a virtue in any sense. It does not imply the iron will that holds rebellious nature in check, but the flabby feebleness that could not resent a wrong if it tried. Imagine the word 'meek' applied to the Speaker of Matthew xxiii.! The *πραεῖς* are the strong souls who beat down within them the impulses of selfishness, who refrain from quenching the dimly burning wick, or breaking off the bruised reed, just *because* they are so bright and so strong themselves (see Isaiah xliii. 4, R.V. margin). For those who refuse to join in the selfish struggle the earth waits as their inheritance. The 'pushful' are ousted by those who refuse to push for place and power.

4. *Happy they that hunger and thirst after righteousness for they will be filled.*

In Luke (cf. i. 53)—

Happy you who hunger now, for you will be filled.

. . . . . .

Alas for you, you who are satiate now, for you will hunger. In this place the interpretation of Matthew has entirely changed the original meaning; and we can only plead that the resultant meaning is in complete harmony both with Old Testament figure (Isa. lv. 1; Ps. xlii. 1) and with the teaching of Christ elsewhere (John iv. 14, vi. 35, vii. 37). It is hard to believe that Luke's form is not the original. It fits the parallel Beatitudes perfectly, and it invited alteration by the very frequency with which hunger and thirst were used as metaphors for spiritual longing.

In Matthew's Beatitude we note how the verbs *πεινᾶν* and *διψᾶν* have become transitive, just as *νηστεύειν* in the Oxyrhynchus Logion which presumably recalls this—*ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ.* The emphatic *αὐτοί*, '*they* and no others,' continues as in the other sayings.

5. *Happy the compassionate, for they will be compassionated.* This Beatitude, not in Luke, was probably due to the editor's adaptation. For as early as Clement of Rome—that is, not much later than the compilation of this Gospel—we find it in a series of sayings having the form of Matthew vii. 1. *Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε* is as plausible a form as that in which Matthew gives it. The inevitable echo in James (ii. 13) decides nothing as to form, and would answer as well to a corresponding Woe. The teaching is, of course, that which is enshrined in the Lord's Prayer and the comment upon it found in Matthew vi. 14, 15, also in Matthew xviii. 21-35, and Luke vi. 36. Shakspeare's exposition is too hackneyed to quote, and too telling to pass by.

6. *Happy the pure in their heart, for they will see God.* Here again we have the thought of a Psalm (xxiv. 4) put into the Beatitude form by Matthew, with support from a Logion which is paraphrased in Hebrews xii. 14. The writer there is actually combining this and the following Beatitude, which probably stood together at some other place in Q, but the language is not exactly followed. (The iambic *οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον* may be presumed accidental.) A suggestive contrast occurs in 1 John iii. 2. There the Beatific Vision produces the change into the same image; here the incipient God-likeness is rewarded by the Beatific Vision. The Beatitude links itself also with Matthew xviii. 10: the 'angels,' or heavenly counterparts, of the little ones are nearest the Throne because their earthly part has not yet

been sullied in heart with sin. (Cf. Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 991*b*.)

7. *Happy the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God.* For the first time the emphatic *αὐτοί* is possibly absent: its omission in ℵ C D and others is hardly balanced by its presence in B, etc., for the tendency to assimilate would be very strong. Once more the question arises whether the Beatitude originally stood in this form. Its absence from Luke is my main reason for doubting; but it may be noted that the echo in James iii. 18 would suit some other form equally well, and the saying may have owed to the editor its initial *μακάριοι*.

Like the fifth and sixth, this Beatitude is based on God-likeness; and the use for the first time of the term 'sons of God,' *i.e.* (in this case) men who reflect what 'is an attribute of God Himself,' shows that this attribute is the most important of the three. It is hardly necessary to copy from the concordance the passages which show how the old savage conception of the God of Battles—in which most Christian nations linger yet to their shame—has been uplifted by the coming of Him whose birth the angels heralded as bringing 'peace among men of God's good pleasure.' When 'the Wisdom from above' became Incarnate below, the spirit of strife was understood at last to be only the activity of the animal in man, 'the lusts that campaign in our members.' Yet even in Old Testament days the Yahweh Sebâ'ôth, God of the armies of Israel, had been slowly transformed in the people's minds into the Lord of the hosts of heaven, and the Prince of Peace. And when New Testament writers bid us '*pursue* Peace'—not sham glory, bastard patriotism, dishonourable honour—they are quoting a Psalm.

Observe the difference between *εἰρηνοποιοί* and *εἰρηνικοί*. The latter may be merely passive. But *οἱ ποιοῦντες εἰρήνην* (James *l.c.*) are not content to be negative. There is great suggestiveness in the New

Testament use of ποιεῖν, as contrasted with the πράσσειν of mere activity which sometimes in the same context describes the doing of evil. The *good* 'that men do lives after them': good is a permanent product and evil a passing phase. 'He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever'; and 'His will is our peace.'

Once more, 'they shall be *called* sons of God.' *Called*, in heaven mostly, where perfect intelligences know how to call things by their right names. But even on earth the recognition is not wholly wanting. Witness the peculiar consideration shown to the Society of Friends, whose abandonment of the outward form of Sacraments must make their leading tenets the rankest heresy to those who lay stress upon that outward form. It is not strange that those who most conspicuously 'pursue peace with all men' should so conspicuously succeed in showing in their members 'the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord.'

The saying of the Lord's brother, which we have been using to illustrate words of a higher authority still, reproduces with singular suggestiveness one of the most beautiful sayings of Hebrew wisdom (Prov. xi. 30):—

> The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life;
> And he that is wise winneth souls.

To *win* men, not to force them—to plant once more the 'fruit of righteousness' which is to turn earth's desert into a 'Garden of the Lord'—well may that be accounted the task of those who are most like God.

8. *Happy they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.* This Beatitude seems to be a generalising of the original in the second person which Luke preserves in its place and Matthew adds as an application. In the Old Testament the *poor* and the *persecuted* are epithets of almost identical meaning applied to the struggling church-nation, fitly consoled with the promise of a

kingdom not of this world. The perfect participle recalls the thought of Revelation ii. 10: it is those who have gone through the fiery trial and proved 'faithful unto death'—'obedient unto (μέχρι) death,' like their Master—who have the reward of final perseverance.

What may be said of this belongs best to the Appendix, as Matthew makes it:—

Happy are you when they have reproached you and persecuted you and said every evil thing against you [falsely] for My sake: rejoice and exult, for your reward is great in the heavens; for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.

Ψευδόμενοι is omitted by the Lewis, by D and some Old Latin (including the Bobiensis), and by Origen, Lucifer, and Hilary. It seems strange that it was not included among Hort's 'Western non-interpolations.' It appears to me a gloss of the same kind as εἰκῆ in verse 22, softening a phrase which was not understood. The libels were bound to be 'false' if they were uttered for Christ's sake.

Instead of 'for my sake' the Old Syriac had 'for my name's sake.' D and the Old Latin repeated the 'for righteousness' sake' from verse 10. There are other traces of assimilation in the Lewis here, which reads 'hate and persecute'; while D and some other Westerns (including *k*) alter the order of διώξωσι—has the verb come in from verse 10? On the other hand the Lewis omits ὀνειδίσωσι.

In Peter:—

Were you even to suffer because of righteousness, happy you (iii. 14).

If you are being reproached in the name of Christ, happy you (iv. 14).

In Luke:—

Happy are you when men have hated you, and when they have boycotted you and reproached (*you*) *and cast out your name as an evil thing for the sake of the Son of man: rejoice in that day and leap, for lo your reward* *is great in heaven; for in the same manner their fathers used to do to the prophets.*

. . . .

Alas when all men have spoken well of you, for in the same manner their fathers used to do to the false prophets. One curious difference between Matthew and Luke here is explained by Wellhausen as starting from the Aramaic 'bring a bad name on you,' which was translated ἐκβαλεῖν ὑμῖν ὄνομα πονηρόν. This is actually found for Luke in the Lewis, 'put forth concerning you a name that is evil.' It is tempting to regard this as the original reading in Luke and in Q, from which Matthew paraphrased. The form of the Greek text would come easily from a misreading of ὑμῖν as ὑμῶν, and a subsequent change of order.

By this time I hope we are ready to agree with Wellhausen's dictum that 'the variants in Luke deserve throughout the preference,' even though we admit with Dr. Moffatt that 'Luke's rendering is truer to the letter, Matthew's to the spirit, of the original.' In the case of this last Beatitude, indeed, the two versions represent two applications of the same principle, Matthew's including times of actual persecution, while Luke's is restricted to conditions such as prevailed during the age of comparative tranquillity before the fires of persecution were kindled, when the 'sect' was 'everywhere spoken against,' and Christians had to endure that social ostracism which is often so much harder to bear than persecution itself. The significant εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε of the Petrine form shows the transition to the new conditions. The application to actual persecution was obvious and wholly justifiable, but the words as originally spoken were more inclusive. Jesus warned His disciples of persecution at other times: here He contemplates conditions which would last longer, as long as faithfulness to His principles provoked antagonism, as long as religion should remain unfashionable and loyalty vulgar in the eyes of a world which became no whit more

Christian when it learnt to pay lip-service to Christian forms.

The χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι of 1 Peter iv. 13, just before the Beatitude, is one of the few external supports we have for the Matthaean against the Lucan phraseology. The vivid σκιρτήσατε (cf. Luke i. 44) can hardly have been invented, however. Notice the aorist imperative in Luke, going with the 'in that day,' the absence of which in Matthew fits the generalised form of the command.

Matthew's concluding τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν, omitted by the Lewis here, as in all the authorities for Luke, may be the editor's gloss, or, as Wellhausen suggests, a translation doublet from Aramaic. The prophets of the Old Dispensation and of the New alike bore 'the reproach of the Christ.'

It would be very easy to enlarge at any length on this new Law of the Kingdom, but we must forbear. We have tried to bring out the probability that our First Evangelist is responsible for its codification as we have it. A skilled lawyer will collect from scattered sources judicial decisions in equity which together make the authoritative law on some particular subject. His book will be recognised according to the fullness and accuracy with which he has made his selection, and this will depend on his own understanding of legal principles as well as on his industry in searching sources. In something like this manner our Evangelist selected dicta from the one Lawgiver to whom Christians listen. We recognise inspiration in the power that has enabled him to bring together just those elements which form the ethical code of Christianity, superseding the mainly external and negative Decalogue of the olden time. I say 'superseding,' but do not mean to suggest that the Ten Words deserve the shallow depreciation which was paraded with all the airs of a discoverer by a writer in the *Hibbert Journal* not long ago. Recognition of their permanent value is consistent with the realisation that they can no longer stand in the forefront of the Christian system as an adequate summary of duty. Every one of them needs the 'But I say to you,' transforming its whole character by taking it from outward action into the springs of action. And for this purpose the Matthaean Beatitudes serve better than any other ethical code. It takes us only a little way, for example, to say 'Thou shalt not kill.' The world accepts this easily (except in war time) but has its gloss ready:—

> Thou shalt not kill, but needst not strive
> Officiously to keep alive.

The New Law beatifies the merciful and the peacemakers, and bids every man do as he would be done by. And so on with the other Commandments. Jesus concentrated the whole Law into one little word. His interpreter Paul showed Love at work, in that incomparable thirteenth chapter of the first letter to Corinth. It was reserved for the first Evangelist, who worked up Matthew's collection of sayings of Jesus, to give us a gem more sharply cut still, each facet flashing with its special brilliance, but with a light that is always one.

SYNOPTIC STUDIES

II. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

In my first Study—which untoward circumstances have separated from this by too wide a gulf—I used the Epistle of James as a document from which we could deduce valuable independent evidence as to the earliest form of sayings of Jesus. But if we are to rely on the Epistle in this way, we must clearly have some sort of a theory as to the date of its composition and its essential character. I deviate into what may seem like a bypath because I believe it is possible to suggest a theory which will meet the central difficulty of the Epistle and at the same time encourage us to use it as a prime authority for the Logia. Perhaps if the personal touch may be allowed, I am all the more ready to digress—if it be a digression—because the Epistle has always been to me no *epistola straminea*, but a golden book to which I have turned sooner than to any of the Epistles except perhaps Philippians, a book the quality of which has been approved not by weight of other people's judgments, but by the irresistible appeal of an authority within it which I at any rate find it impossible to gainsay.

The son of Joseph and Mary—for such I take the author to be, while necessarily avoiding a restatement of reasons for adopting this side—James avows himself the 'slave' of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, whose human brother he was well known to be. But having thus declared himself, he drops all overt reference to Christian faith, and only names the Master in a verse where the forced order of the words raises an extremely strong presumption of a gloss. He seeks a supreme example of endurance in Job, instead of bidding his readers 'consider Him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against themselves.' And yet his short pages are simply studded with quotations from, and allusions to, the Words of Jesus, so that the theory that we have only a Jewish work, doctored in one or two passages, becomes positively grotesque. Into what age of Church history are we to put a book which presents such contradictions? We might naturally take refuge in the view, ably presented by Professor Currie Martin in a recent *Expositor*, that the Epistle shows us little about Christ just because it is almost made up of His own words. But if it was known to be a collection of Logia, how could it fail to be widely known and eagerly read from an early date? The long and doubtful fight it made for inclusion in the Canon is not easily explained on this hypothesis.

And yet I venture to believe that Mr. Martin has come nearer to the truth than most of his predecessors in this complex critical investigation. Has any one yet proposed to regard the Epistle as addressed *by a Christian to Jews*? The 'Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion,' of course, most naturally suggest such a destination. The 'synagogue' of ii. 2 will then be Jewish, and the rich men who are so sternly denounced will be more easily found than if we have to seek them in a Christian community of any date prior to the age of Constantine. Now of all the Christians of the first century who are known to us, James is the only one who had in any sense the ear of the Jews. The well-known story of Hegesippus, improbable enough in its main features, may fairly be trusted in its picture of a man whose loyalty to the Law and the Temple, sanctity of life and faithful adherence to the Jewish ideal of righteousness, had long commanded the reverence of fellow-countrymen bitterly hostile to Christians of the Pauline type. Is it not wholly in character that he should endeavour to plead with his countrymen abroad, waking afresh the tones of ancient prophecy and ancient 'Wisdom' alike, and weaving in a whole fabric of ethical teaching that had fallen from the lips of the supreme Prophet? To name Him would have been to frustrate his whole purpose. Others might argue His Messiahship by appealing to the Scriptures, and when Jews were as candid and open-minded as those of Beroea such a method would be abundantly fruitful. But a far larger number would be deaf to all argument which even named the Crucified, and he who would reach them must try another way. Could there be a better than to write as a Jew to Jews, threading the pearls of Christ's own teaching on a string of miscellaneous exhortation, all tending to shame them out of a blind unbelief rooted in party spirit (*ἐριθεία*)? Jews who would read this Epistle could often without great difficulty be led on to read such a book as our First Gospel, in which they would learn with surprise that many of the sayings they had accepted as heavenly wisdom, when purporting to come from a pious and orthodox Jew, were really due to Him whom all orthodox Jews had agreed never to hear.

Of course this theory involves rejecting as early Christian glosses the two passages which do name the Lord Jesus. In the address we may assume the writer calls himself simply 'James, bondservant of God.' In ii. 1 the Greek becomes clear and normal when we read, 'Hold not the faith of the Lord of Glory with respect of persons': cf. Psalm xxix. 3, xxiv. 7—not exact parallels, but near enough to suggest to the Jewish reader a perfectly natural and to him unobjectionable meaning, while retaining for the author a veiled allusion to Jesus.

The subsequent fate of the Epistle seems to become very much clearer on this theory. Among the Jews its chance of success would be ultimately barred by its author's martyrdom as a Christian at the hands of

Jews.[1] Among the Christians it never had a chance of popularity. The absence of specifically Christian doctrine in it, and the presence of doctrine which to superficial readers looked like an attack on Paulinism, combined to prevent its being much read. It would owe its preservation to the small and diminishing circle of Palestinian Christians among whom the memory of James was cherished: to them would be due the addition of the missing words in i. 1 and ii. 1 which James had in his heart but forced his pen to omit. Gradually, as relics of the Apostolic Age grew rarer and rarer, this gem emerged from its obscurity, and what may well be the earliest writing of the New Testament took its rightful place in the Canon.[2]

Before proceeding to apply this theory to some important passages in the Epistle, let me give a modern parallel which is worth recounting for its own sake. A few years ago one of the most learned of our missionaries in India, the Rev. Benjamin Robinson, of the W.M.S., sent in a Kanarese tract to a Christian literature agency with a view to its publication. Its purpose was to awaken the activity of conscience, as the inward witness of right and wrong, the very name for which, as used in Christian Indian literature, was supposed [3] to be a coinage of the missionaries. It reproduced a story from the Mahābhārata. King Duṣyanta, hunting in a forest, fell in love with Çakuntalā, the adopted daughter of the hermit Kaṇva, and married her, with a pledge that her son should have his throne. He went home and forgot her. When the boy was twelve years old, Çakuntalā went at Kanva's bidding to the king's court to claim his promise. The king recognised her, but denied her and bade her begone. She said [1]:

---

[1] Josephus, *Ant.* XX. ix. 1.

[2] I should note here that the first suggestion of this theory came to me from a question asked me in class by one of my students, Mr. Mountford. Mr. Robinson (see below) reminds one of a good parallel in what Schürer says (*Jewish People*, E.T., II. iii. 279 f.) about the Sibyllines and other 'Jewish propaganda under a heathen mask.'

[3] Wrongly, as Mr. Robinson points out; the word (*manaḥsākṣi*, lit. 'mind-witness') occurs in a version of the Rāmāyaṇa by Pampa, a Kanarese poet, born 902 A.D.

> 'I am alone,' thou deemest. . . .
> Sinning, one thinks 'None is aware of me,'
> And the gods are aware of him, and the man within.
> Sun and Moon, Fire and Wind,
> Sky, Earth, Waters, Heart and Yama;
> Day too, and Night, and both Twilights,
> And Dharma know the conduct of a man.

The subsequent history of Mr. Robinson's tract continues the parallel. One missionary to whom it was referred returned it with the comment that a Hindu might read it and worship in the nearest temple more devoutly than ever. Which was just what its author intended—a Hindu who had learnt from his own sacred books the idea of conscience as the 'inward man,' the witness of secret sin, was thereby nearer to the Kingdom of God and more accessible to the appeal of Christ. Happily the tract was published, and has its audience still. It is to be fervently hoped that the growth of the study of comparative religion will make Christian missionaries increasingly ready to adopt methods which were so conspicuously used by St. Paul—to bind up the bruised reed and fan to a flame the smouldering wick of pagan religion, assured that every glimmering light of Truth was kindled ultimately from Him who is the Light of the world and the only source of Truth. But this is by the way.

Let us now assume that the Epistle of James was a composition of this class, a Christian's appeal to non-Christians, which veils Christian terms and names in order to insinuate Christian truth into prejudiced minds.[2] We will treat it as addressed to Jews of the

---

[1] I give the passage as translated by a high authority, Mr. F. W. Thomas, of the India Office Library.

[2] My friend, Dr. A. S. Peake, suggests a good parallel in Charles Reade's *It is Never too Late to Mend.* So in chap. xxxi: 'And then she secretly quoted the New Testament to him [the Jew Levi], having

Dispersion, though applicable in many ways to the conditions of Palestine, the author's home. At the outset we are confronted with social conditions which are natural enough in any Jewish community, but difficult to find among Christians during the ages of persecution. There is 'the congregation of God's poor,' oppressed by nominal co-religionists, to whom they are prone to show a grovelling deference whenever one of these plutocrats deigns to visit their synagogue. The teaching of Christ on the subject of riches and its possessors was wholly in the line of the ancient prophets' doctrine: respect of persons, the beatification of the proud and the wealthy, the lingering superstition that poverty and trial were proofs of Divine displeasure, all demanded readjusting to a right perspective by words of authority which set forth the will of Israel's God. For this and for the scathing of the wealthy tyrants who ground the faces of the poor while professing devotion to the faith of Israel, there were sayings of Jesus in plenty ready to the hand of one who knew them well. James embedded them in kindred exhortations, drawn partly from Hebrew *ḥokhma*, and partly from the stores of a latter-day Amos whose indignation at social wrong had been kindled in the white flame of the wrath of Jesus towards everything that defied the 'Royal Law.'

'They say, and do not,' was the burden of Christ's denunciation of the Scribes. It could hardly be questioned that an enlargement on this theme would always be peculiarly appropriate before an audience of Jews. Keenly sensitive about orthodoxy, passionately dogmatic as to the monotheistic creed (ii. 19), which creed if a man held pure and undefiled, without doubt he should be saved everlastingly, the Jews assuredly needed the prophetic voice that told them a greater

---

first ascertained that he had never read it; and he wondered where on earth this simple girl had picked up so deep a wisdom and so lofty and self-denying a morality.' Cf. also pp. 236 f. (chapter xxxii.), 'I will not tell you whence I had them,' etc.

truth—that the hosts of hell were as orthodox as Jews ever could be, and that no orthodoxy was worth anything if it did not inspire a noble life.[1] How many sayings of Jesus were used by James in enforcing this doctrine we cannot tell: we can recognise some clearly enough, and we know that in all the Master's teaching there was nothing so conspicuously reiterated as the great lesson of applied religion which closes the Sermon on the Mount. In driving home his antithesis of faith and works, James obviously means by faith not much more than mere belief.[2] Such a meaning was natural in purely Jewish circles. How could it ever be natural among those whose whole thought was shaped by the words of Jesus, for whom 'faith' meant a childlike trust in a heavenly Father, too wise to err and too good to be unkind? If the Epistle is a late Christian writing, it is an all but incredible reversion to a pre-Christian type. Make it early, and addressed to Jews, and we can see clearly how the Christian teacher used the name as it was used in his audience but strove to add to the narrow conception what would enrich it infinitely. Faith, orthodoxy, when demonstrated by practical holiness which sprang from it (ii. 18), was a grace Paul could bless as warmly as James. The use of *πίστις* in Paul and Hebrews belongs palpably to a later stage of thought, bearing the unmistakable marks of Christ's teaching. For Priscilla—if she be the great unknown—the child's trust in the Father becomes 'the title-deeds[1] of things hoped for,' the promises of One so implicitly trusted being treated as realised assets instead of possible futures. For Paul it was the almighty touch of life which made him one with Christ, a perfect trust producing a perfect fellowship that nothing could break or mar. The word has gone far indeed from the stage in which it was capable of being conceived as a possession of the very demons!

---

[1] This is quite consistent with the existence in Judaism of a strong tendency towards emphasising 'orthopraxy' beyond orthodoxy. Professor Peake recalls what Mr. Herford says on this point in the introduction of his *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash.* An observer of our present-day religious conditions might find abundant evidence for asserting that we lay all the stress on creed, or on practice: it would depend on the circles he happened to visit, or the books he happened to read. And even one and the same teacher, if his sayings were isolated, might easily be quoted for both sides: we all tend to exaggerate the particular side of the truth for which at any moment we are pleading. This obvious consideration should be borne in mind when we try to estimate the prevailing trend of doctrine in another age, which like our own was profoundly interested in religious theory and praxis.

[2] I guard this in deference to Professor Peake, whose opinion on such matters has peculiar weight. It seems to me that the meaning of πίστις in ii. 14-26 is mainly conditioned by verse 19. But the natural Jewish exegesis of Gen. xv. 6 (verse 23) has to be allowed its influence. The citations in Lightfoot's excursus (*Galatians*, 158 ff.) shows that in purely Jewish circles *belief* often came to include very much of the meaning *trust*, and that the faith of Abraham was interpreted by Philo and others in a sense not differing widely from Paul's own. May we say then that James starts with the idea of credal orthodoxy, but that his sense of the necessary consequences of this forces into the word, before the paragraph concludes, a decidedly deeper meaning? It was still not a meaning which would be unfamiliar in the Jewish schools.

'Saying and Doing' is in another form the theme of the third chapter. Even the Twelve had needed to be warned against the ambition to be 'called Rabbi,' so ingrained in a people whose admiration for their teachers had been largely responsible for making the Pharisees into the pretentious humbugs they most of them were. James's sermon on the Tongue is very obviously based on his Master's teaching. The study of his words makes us feel at once that the Jewish world of his time was far more in need of such a warning than the Christian community. *Odium theologicum* always burnt fiercely in Jewish air; and when there were Christians to curse, as well as Jews of other parties, we may feel that James's remonstrance was very much to the point. The *εἰρηνοποιοί* on whom he pronounces afresh the Master's benediction were not mere good-natured flabby people whose motto was 'anything for a quiet life.' '*Make* peace; *pursue* peace'—treat it as the first of all God's demands, and use all your powers to secure the prize—such is the message of Inspiration to Zealots of the old time and Jingoes of the new, to Jews cursing Christians in the first century and Christians cursing one another in the twentieth.

---

[1] See my note, *Expositor*, VI. viii. 439 (Dec. 1903).

The very climax of impossibility seems to be reached when we try to apply the fourth chapter to a Christian community of any earlier date than the fourth century. 'You covet and possess not—then you do murder. You envy and cannot attain—then you fight and war.' Are we to water this down to metaphor? To treat φονεύετε thus is hard enough; and if ever the principle of the *difficilior lectio* applied, it surely steps in here to bar the obvious conjecture φθονεῖτε, introduced by Erasmus for the first time and followed by Luther. And the picture of prosperity and worldliness, love of pleasure and giddy selfishness, which prompts the prophet's mingled tenderness and severity, is extraordinarily incongruous if it belongs to a sect which was everywhere spoken against, membership of which might any day involve martyrdom. Christians of *this* stamp were surely the proud product of Constantine's well-meant revolution, and not of any earlier conditions. There are many passages on which we might dwell in discussing this view of the Epistle, but we will be content with one more, v. 6. Can we take this as an allusion to 'the Righteous One, of whom the Jews had become betrayers and murderers'? In our theory, of course, this must not be more than a particular application—albeit supreme in the writer's own mind—of a general charge which had very often justified itself only too completely. The verse is the echo of Matthew xxiii. 35.

A word may be added in conclusion as to the objections which Harnack raises against Spitta's theory. It does not at all follow that they will hold against the rather similar but vitally different theory defended here. We no longer have to remark on the absence of Rabbinical conceits and puerilities: the absence of obtrusively Christian doctrine and of the lower forms of Judaism comes alike from our postulate. Among the passages which Harnack regards as difficult to refer to a Jewish document, there do not seem to be any which refuse to suit the other view. In i. 18, 25, 27, ii. 12 we may readily agree that the language is improbable enough on the lips of a non-Christian Jew. But so long as it did not repel the Jewish reader by suggesting that the doctrine was positively heterodox, one sees no reason why James should not use such words. The Parousia of the Judge in v. 7 ff. is a little more difficult. But the thought does not go one whit beyond what Amos had said centuries before. 'Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel,' is re-iterated here with solemn emphasis ; and if the writer himself believes that Jehovah is coming in His Son, his language is absolutely capable of the Jewish connotation. Nor is Parousia a technical Christian term. The Petrie papyri have shown us that it was used two or three centuries earlier —without epithet or even article—as a sufficient expression for a *royal visit* ; and it is likely enough that a word suggesting such an idea would be used in Jewish circles to describe the 'day of the Lord' for which the prophets had prepared them. And even if the word had never actually been thus used, its application would cause no surprise. There remains one more difficulty, the use of πίστις in i. 3, 'recognising that what is genuine in your belief works out endurance.' It does not seem necessary to assume here that the Jewish reader would see anything strange. True belief, a holding of the Creed of Israel as no mere formality, but a possession dearer than life, had worked out endurance of a very wonderful kind in the days of the Maccabees. See further above.

Our next task will be to see what form the sayings of Jesus had in the source, written or oral, which was used by James.

SYNOPTIC STUDIES

III. SOME CRITICISMS ON PROFESSOR HARNACK'S 'SAYINGS OF JESUS'

CIRCUMSTANCES too strong for the best of good intentions have made it impossible to continue these occasional studies on any sort of plan; and I make no further apology for deserting the subject proposed at the end of my last paper (July 1907). Professor Harnack's *Sprüche*[1] has raised afresh the most difficult of all Synoptic problems, and I propose to set down some of the questionings that have come up in the study of his book, as a small contribution towards settling the form of Q. What I have to say will be mainly confined to the earlier part of the book, in which Harnack reconstructs the text of Q. That such a reconstruction must be tentative at best is obvious, but we may get a little nearer to our goal by discussing principles.

Harnack's general method proceeds on the theory that Luke altered Q very freely on stylistic grounds, the alterations of 'Matthew' being of a more material character though less frequent. There are one or two general criticisms that may be passed upon this theory before we take some definite examples. In deciding what is linguistically more primitive, Harnack has made some assumptions which can no longer be taken for granted. One is that if either Matthew or Luke has a compound verb where the other has the simplex, we must assume that Q had the latter. No attempt is made to prove this, and we are ultimately shown what simple Greek the author of Q used because of the great predominance of uncompounded verbs in his vocabulary. But it does not seem to have been observed before that Mark, who writes the least cultured Greek to be found in the New Testament (outside the Apocalypse), has an extraordinary affection for compound verbs. In proportion to the length of his Gospel, he has exactly as many compound verbs as Luke, and he is only surpassed in this respect by the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Acts, the latter only by a small amount. Passing from the New Testament to the papyri, we find that the pre-Christian private letters in Witkowski's useful little collection [1] show a considerably higher proportion of compounds, and the letters there which are marked as illiterate have this characteristic nearly as strongly as the educated ones. There are other papyrus letters which dislike the compounds as much as the Fourth Gospel does ; but this does not affect the point—the connection between culture and compound verbs must go,[2] and with it a criterion on the strength of which Harnack decides for Matthew against Luke in dozens of places. Matthew's preference for the simplex is as likely to have ousted Q's compounds as Luke's preference for compounds is to have altered Q's simplicia : we must judge each case on its merits.

---

[1] The quotations throughout are from the English edition. What a pity it is, by the way, that more care has not been taken with the proof-reading. The Greek accents are shocking; and a misprint like 'casual' for 'causal' (p. 306—original '*begründend*') might give trouble.

Another important note to make is that Harnack sometimes determines what is literary Greek (and therefore presumably an emendation of the rougher text of Q) by canons drawn from the literature alone. But here the papyri must have their say. Ἐπηρεάζειν looks literary enough, and Harnack assumes it to be Luke's emendation accordingly (p. 61) ; but it and its noun *ἐπήρεια* occur in papyrus petitions that owe nothing to the schoolmaster. This is not the only word which takes a different literary complexion when the vernacular documents are compared. *Ἱματισμός* may or may not be original in Luke vii. 25, but it is a good popular word. So are *ἐνώπιον* and *ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι* (p. 84), *σουδάριον* (p. 125), *παραγίνεσθαι* (p. 86), and the phrase *ἐὰν γένηται*, c. inf. (p. 92—cf. my *Prolegomena*, p. 17); while *σιτομέτριον* occurs in the Petrie Papyri and the LXX, and the fact that its verb is censured by Phrynichus shows that it was good colloquial Greek. Whether *ψυχὴν ἀπολέσαι* appeared to Luke the Hellene 'too paradoxical' (p. 114), we may question when we find *σῶσαι ψυχὰς πολλάς* in a papyrus of pre-Christian date (TbP I. 56 = Witkowski,^{2} p. 99).

---

[1] *Epistulæ Privatae Graecae* (Teubner, 1906).

[2] Professor Burkitt remarks in a letter to me, after seeing my figures, that in English 'Come with me' is literary, 'Come along with me' is colloquial. This is, in fact, a thoroughly typical example.

There are, I believe, a fair number of places where we can demonstrate stylistic alteration on the part of the first Evangelist: the presence of these must naturally affect our judgment as to the principles of reconstruction. Matthew certainly dropped some vulgar forms which the literary Luke retained: that Luke *introduced* them is surely improbable in the extreme. Thus in Matthew vi. 30 the literary *ἀμφιέννυσιν* is obviously, on Harnack's own principles, less original than the Lucan *ἀμφιάζει*, which, however, Harnack ignores (pp. 5, 140). In Matthew xxiii. 37 (p. 29) no one will suppose that the literary Hellene deliberately altered the correct *ἐπισυναγαγεῖν* of Q (so Harnack, p. 143) into the vulgar *ἐπισυνάξαι* (Luke xiii. 34), which is at home in the quite uneducated papyri. And this obvious consideration—which we may be quite sure Dr. Harnack would acknowledge when brought to his notice—suggests what seems to me a much more probable account of the relation between Matthew iii. 12 and Luke iii. 17 than that which is given on p. 2. In Luke *l.c.* ℵ^a reads *συνάξαι*, of which one can hardly doubt both *συναγαγεῖν* of ℵ*B and *συνάξει* of Matthew are alternative and independent corrections. It accordingly stood in Q, with *διακαθᾶραι*; and this construction was very simply mended by Matthew, to whom it seemed cumbrous. Harnack declares it to be an improvement on the two indicatives. This is clearly a matter of taste: the opposite conclusion seems more natural to me. Anyhow I must claim *συνάξαι* as self-evidencing, and this reading is only in Luke.

Difference of taste indeed rather frequently makes itself apparent in these questions; and one has a natural shrinking from confession of a difference where the opposite judgment comes from so consummate an authority as Harnack. One can only record the point and leave other students to choose. On p. 26 we read that *ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν* in Luke x. 24 'is an obvious stylistic improvement' on Matthew's *ἐπεθύμησαν*. I have tried hard to see the obviousness, but cannot resist the conclusion that 'longed to see' is more forcible than 'wished to see,' which last I feel sure would never have been admitted by an artist like Luke, if it had not stood in his source. In Matthew iv. 6 we miss *ἐντεῦθεν* after *βάλε σεαυτόν*, and we are told (p. 46) that is 'a Lucan interpolation.' What conceivable reason had Luke for inserting it? 'The word is found elsewhere in St. Luke.' Yes, *once*! Is it not more reasonable to say that Matthew dropped it as otiose, and Luke kept it because it was in Q? There are other points in the restoration of Q in the Temptation story where I cannot feel confidence in the result. Would not Matthew xii. 40 justify us in claiming that 'forty nights' is a Matthaean phrase and therefore interpolated? Dr. Harnack himself declares that 'the genuine text is the shortest' here; and there are many places where one or two parallels are enough to make him claim a phrase as Lucan and therefore interpolated. Are we justified in crediting Q with the 'exceeding high mountain,' when the very vague *ἀναγαγών* so obviously demanded expansion? That Matthew does thus interpret is demonstrable in many passages. When Harnack asks (p. 45) why

Matthew should have changed the one stone into 'stones,' it might fairly be replied that a single loaf would be absurdly insufficient to satisfy hunger, if the loaves were like those they make in Palestine to-day. A motive for Matthew's transposition of 'the glory of them' into the introductory line (iv. 8) might be found in the fact that *αὐτῶν* refers back to *βασιλείας* in a very clumsy way: Luke left it as it stood in Q but would never have introduced it. As to Luke's 'extravagant' *οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδέν*, does not he use a similar phrase in just the same sense in Acts xxvii. 33? It would be absurd to suppose that the sailors had literally taken no food for a fortnight! I should seek further instances of Matthew's habit of abbreviating—which indeed is what he constantly does with the narrative of Mark—in iii. 11, where *βαστάσαι* 'remove'[1] neatly concentrates the whole content of 'stoop down and unloose'; and in xi. 27, where *ἐπιγινώσκει* exactly expresses the meaning of the longer phrase *γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν* found in Luke and (as I am convinced) Q.[2] That Matthew paraphrases hard sayings when necessary I should show from x. 37, as one conspicuous example among many: the paradoxical *μισεῖν* is supported by the Fourth Gospel (in the parallel to ver. 39 and Luke xiv. 26), and would never have been introduced by a Gentile Evangelist. That Luke actually ousted the clear phrase of Matthew (cf. p. 87) in favour of one which he knew would make readers stumble is a view which only conformity to theory would suggest.

A few miscellaneous points may be collected. On p. 19 Harnack notes that *πᾶς* is 'a favourite word' of Luke's.[3] This may be, though as a matter of fact *πᾶς* occurs a hundred and twenty-eight times in the

[1] A meaning recognised by R.V. in John xii. 6, and abundantly witnessed in papyri.

[2] This depends on the interpretation of *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, which I now think Dean Armitage Robinson has proved in his excursus in *Ephesians*. See my *Prolegomena*,³ p. 113.

[3] Cf. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 85.

W.H. text of Matthew and only a hundred and fifty-seven times in Luke: this is respectively 1·88 and 2·18 per page—not a very striking disparity. But Harnack at least twice accepts πᾶς (or ἅπας) for Q because it stands in Matthew (pp. 5 and 73), though Luke there does not use this pet word of his. We are told (pp. 20 and 274) that ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ 'is a specifically Lucan expression,' on the strength of six [1] occurrences: 'on the other hand, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ is only found in St. Matthew (twice again), and most probably comes from Q.' I cannot understand why the latter phrase is not on this showing 'a specifically Matthaean expression.' When Luke uses 'the finger of God' and Matthew 'the spirit of God,' we find (p. 21) that the former 'substitutes the Biblical expression': why then are we 'not certain' whether the same account should be given of Matthew's 'birds of the heaven' as against Luke's 'ravens' (p. 36)? Similarly (p. 49) Harnack rejects Luke's κλαίοντες in the Beatitudes in favour of Matthew's πενθοῦντες, which, however, strongly suggests assimilation to Isaiah lxi. 1.

In the well-known difficulty of Matthew v. 40 = Luke vi. 29, Harnack takes for granted that the idea of judicial action is more primitive than that of the robber clutching at the garment that comes first. I am afraid I cannot regard this as self-evident, though I am not going to argue for the opposite view. I could quite imagine that Matthew has after his manner conformed the precept to the Old Testament, and made it refer to taking the poor man's garment as a pledge. On the same page (60) we find Harnack's treatment of the Lord's Prayer. That the Prayer in Matthew's form has been affected by liturgical use seems to me extremely probable.[2] I prefer this to the assumption that Matthew has made the additions himself. But if this is so, why not regard the δίδου as original, the δός as an assimilation to the other aorists, appropriate when the Prayer has passed into daily use? The isolation of this present imperative seems to me a strong plea for its originality.[1] In that case Luke has the Prayer very nearly as it stood in Q: that the reading 'Let Thy Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us' is the true text of Luke is a decision we must be allowed to doubt,[2] and otherwise Luke's form approves itself in almost everything.

---

[1] Harnack says seven on p. 274. Taking Luke's two books together, the Lucan αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (with or without ἐν) occurs eight times, which would answer to 3·8 times in a book of the length of Matthew.

[2] I may refer here to an excellent article by Mgr. A. S. Barnes in the *Contemporary Review* for August 1906.

It seems fair to plead that Harnack is hardly consistent when he lays so much stress on Luke's stylistic alterations and then credits him with 'a feeble word' which he was 'fond of using' (ἐγγίζειν, p. 66). When this same word occurs in Matthew, it is original (p. 81). Now in this place (Matthew vi. 20) the phrase 'dig through' may very well be repeated from xxiv. 43, where the verb occurs in a Q passage: Matthew is fond of repeating his phraseology. And with all deference to the instinct of a great scholar like Harnack, might I suggest a doubt as to the 'feebleness' of the phrase in Luke xii. 33—'where thief never comes near it, nor does the moth destroy it'? We are told on p. 73 that 'the falling was great' (Matthew vii. 27) is a 'solecism,' so that Luke's 'great breach' is a correction. Possibly, but I demur to the 'solecism.' Perhaps in Germany they have no analogue to 'Humpty Dumpty had a great fall,' which in English at any rate is idiomatic enough. Turning a few pages, we have a criticism of the order of clauses in Matthew viii. 11, 12, and Luke xiii. 28, 29. It is said that the clause 'There (ἐκεῖ) shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth' is out of place in Luke, because the ἐκεῖ is out of connection. 'The change of order in St. Luke is due to the transposition of ἐκεῖ κ.τ.λ. to the beginning, for which the reason is not obvious.' Exactly—but is not the very fact that the transposition is *ex hypothesi* meaningless a sufficient reason why the literary Luke should not have ventured upon it? That Matthew's order is better is a reason against its being original, if we are to apply the reasoning by which Harnack is constantly refusing originality to Luke.

---

[1] In *Prolegomena*, p. 119, I expressed a different opinion: it is altered in ed.^{3}

[2] Chase (*The Lord's Prayer*, pp. 25 ff.), after citing the scanty but widespread evidence for the clause, suggests a liturgical origin ultimately based on passages in Acts.

There are a great many points in which I cannot feel satisfied that Harnack has justly set aside Luke's phraseology; but it is not worth while to mention them where it is only a case of taste against taste. Two or three more instances might be given in which the case does not seem proven. Why on p. 83 is μὴ φοβηθῆτε in Luke xii. 4 said to be 'more elegant than μὴ φοβεῖσθε' of Matthew x. 28? Because it is more appropriate—'Do not be afraid (in the future)' followed in verse 7 by 'Do not be afraid (as this prophecy prompts you to be')? Is it not more likely that Matthew with his love for uniformity levelled a distinction that seemed otiose? Later on in the same section there is an 'enigma' which seems to me fairly easy—'the existence of the variants, "two sparrows for a farthing" and "five sparrows for two farthings."' I have always assumed the working of the ordinary commercial principle of reduction on taking a quantity. 'Had sparrows become cheaper?' is Harnack's answer, on the strength of which, as usual, he votes for Matthew's form. But surely if we are to choose between the complex price and the simpler one here, it is easier to assume that Matthew got rid of a superfluity than that Luke invented one for no apparent purpose; for the two prices must be regarded as equivalent to one another on ordinary rules. In the Woes on the Pharisees I find it hard to see 'the cold, matter-of-fact tone of' Luke xi. 47, 48 (p. 102); while in assuming that Luke has introduced 'greater precision' in writing οἴκου for ναοῦ, Harnack appears to overlook the distinction between ναός and ἱερόν. As a matter of fact *ναός* is a better Greek equivalent of *οἶκος*, which was a piece of literalism that Luke would never have admitted had he not found it in his source. That Luke has avoided the word *παρουσία* (p. 107) as belonging 'to the sphere of Jewish Messianic dogma,' and 'an unsuitable term for that Second Coming in which Christians believed,' appears very strange in view of Paul's frequent use of the word. It has become clear that the word was a current vernacular term for a *royal visitation*,[1] and so a most suggestive and natural word on Paul's lips for the Return of the King of Heaven. Why should a disciple of Paul avoid the word except because it was not in his source?

Nearly three years ago, in a paper on the Beatitudes (*Expositor*, August 1906), I pleaded for the superior originality of Luke in this section, and I feel bound to maintain this still. In that connection I called attention to the way in which Matthew is inclined to heighten parallelism: I compared the tendency of the Oxyrhynchus Logia, in which this is carried yet further. Now Professor Harnack notes (p. 18) that parallelism is frequent in Q, and that Matthew 'has often destroyed it from a desire for brevity.' If this is so, I am convinced that he has also not infrequently mended his source so as to show poetical symmetry. It is hard to understand how Luke, with his sense for literary form, should deliberately destroy such a perfectly balanced series of parallel clauses as we find in Matthew vii. 24-27. It is Harnack himself who has laid such stress on Luke's authorship of the canticles in chapters i. and ii. The various motives which Harnack suggests (pp. 72-74) for Luke's marring of this passage seem to me beside the mark: it is much more probable that Matthew worked up a Q passage, which Luke has retained with little alteration. I should, on the same ground, differ from Harnack's decision (p. 29) that Matthew xviii. 7*b* is better than Luke xvii. 1*b*, 'because of the parallelism.' We may cite Matthew vii. 9, 10 as another example : in Luke (and Q) we have Fish and Serpent, Egg and Scorpion —two *harmful* things given instead of necessary food ; while in Matthew the parallelism is heightened by prefixing Loaf and Stone, from which merely *useless* substitution there is a climactic rise to the harmful. (Matthew got it probably from the similar association in iv. 3, and of course he rejected the superfluous third clause in consequence.) In the same chapter we notice also verses 15-20 with their beautifully balanced sequence. Now the essence of this passage appears in xii. 33, which answers to Luke vi. 43, 44 ; the correspondence of verse 45 there with Matthew xii. 35 shows that Matthew's second presentation of the passage properly belongs to the Sermon, rather than the first. Matthew has apparently worked up the rough and disconnected saying of Q to fit its place in the Sermon, and has then repeated it in a later discourse, with a form less differing from Q : Luke has kept it nearly as he found it. Such an account harmonises with all we find in the First Evangelist's setting of the Sermon. Recognising the fragmentary character of the discourse as it stood in Q, he gathered together kindred matter from other sources and from other parts of Q and arranged them with wonderful skill round a connected sequence of thought. He found the pearls scattered, and he provided a string whereon to display them. Few would care to say that Luke found the necklace complete, but broke the string and let half of the pearls be scattered.

---

[1] See Milligan's *Thessalonians*, pp. 145 f.

I should like to close with a note on Matthew xi. 16, 17=Luke vii. 31, 32. The key to the form of Q seems to be found in the reading λέγοντες for ἃ λέγει in Luke. This is attested by D and L, the Ferrar group, six Old Latin MSS. and the Bohairic : since ἃ λέγει can be immediately explained from assimilation to Matthew, this reading seems better, despite ℵB. Now this involves taking προσφωνοῦσιν as indicative —'and they call to one another, saying. . . .' In that case Matthew's *προσφωνοῦντα* may be based on a natural misunderstanding, which further caused the *λέγοντες* to be changed to *ἃ . . . λέγουσιν.* Probably also *τοῖς ἑτέροις* is a stylistic alteration for *ἀλλήλοις* of Q: strictly speaking, only *one* party said this to the other. Now note that with Luke's reading the parable comes out right, for the 'generation' is represented by the sulky children *to* whom 'they call.' The subject is indefinite, and the *ἀλλήλοις* invites mending; but these are roughnesses due to Q, which Luke did not remove. Matthew did—but with the result that the parts in the parable are inverted. For the well-known crux which Matthew presents in the context of this passage (xi. 12)—Luke removes it to a distance, and it can hardly have been connected in Q—I venture to suggest that both Evangelists have tried to interpret by expansion a shorter ambiguous phrase. Suppose that Q had simply *οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος μέχρι* (or *ἕως*) *Ἰωάνου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βιάζεται,* 'The prophets, and the law, were until John: from his time the kingdom is being eagerly entered,' or 'forced on.' Matthew had to adapt this saying, which he took from a different context, and he gave his interpretation of the difficult *βιάζεται* by adding a clause. Luke in his turn paraphrases the word independently, using easier language for an idea not likely to be understood by Gentile readers, but makes a minimum of change in the words.

I do not like to close a paper devoted wholly to criticism without a word of whole-hearted appreciation of these 'Studies' of the great master to whom theology owes so much. In doctrinal presuppositions he stands more with German scholarship than with British: even the less conservative among us would give much more extended holidays to the word 'legend' than they are disposed to do beyond the Rhine! But for that very reason British liberals in theology welcome the more heartily the researches of one who cannot be suspected of bias, and one who writes with authority unequalled among all our living scholars. In this volume Professor Harnack gives us some declarations of high importance, which will be eagerly welcomed by men who try to defend on modern lines the central doctrine of Christianity. The high antiquity and trustworthiness of Q, the argument in favour of our Lord's having used words about Himself implying a unique relation to God, and the crushing condemnations of certain latter-day extravagances of criticism falsely so called, will serve as examples. Nor can one easily forget the excursus in his third volume (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 290-297) in which he states the 'weighty considerations' in favour of dating Acts 'as early as the beginning of the seventh decade of the first century.' He does not adopt this date, as against 'the time of Titus or the earlier years of Domitian'; but he leaves it open, and meanwhile gives the case for this astonishingly early date, with arguments greatly weakening the case for the later one. *Acts* in the early sixties and *Luke* of course to precede it—*Mark* therefore in the fifties and Q no one knows how much earlier still! And this comes to us as a recognised possibility, not from an 'apologist,' bound hand and foot to a tradition which itself never pleaded for dates so early, but from the author of *What is Christianity?* and the most famous scholar in the greatest University in the world. It fairly takes our breath away. Perhaps the 'legends' about the Resurrection may yet be studied afresh on modern scientific lines—lines lying, one presumes, at more or less distance alike from Professor Lake's and Professor Orr's—and prove to have some truth in them after all!

MARANATHA—IN THE FIRST AND THE TWENTIETH CENTURIES

AMONG all the more recent sensations that have come over to us from German thought, few have caused more of a flutter in theological circles than Schweitzer's *From Reimarus to Wrede*, so consummately translated by Mr. Montgomery under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. It was commended to our earnest attention by the veteran leader of scientific conservatism in British theology, Dr. Sanday, and more or less swallowed whole by the brilliant and outspoken Professor Burkitt of the Cambridge Divinity School, whose distinguished colleague, Professor Inge, has roundly condemned it as blasphemous—not for the first time grievously misunderstanding a German 'heretic' who has much to teach us if we read him with discrimination. I do not propose to spend time this afternoon in a critical review of the doctrines which Schweitzer has popularised among our thoughtful preachers and church members. Rather I want to go down at once to the roots of things, and see how the deepest verities that we have to preach are affected by new questions arising as to the person and the objects of Him whom we call Master and Lord.

One curious aspect of the controversies that are around us I may allude to before I take up the subject of my paper. We get the impression from various quarters that what is called Liberal Christianity is fighting for its life just now against foes from opposite sides. I need hardly remind you that 'Liberal' is a term that covers a very wide range; and that there are a great many of us who claim our place in the army of progress who are very far from accepting the Christology of the school of Harnack and Bousset, however warmly we welcome much that they have brought to us. For this school Jesus of Nazareth was the greatest of all prophets, a supreme teacher of righteousness and the love of God, who died as a martyr to the cause of the truth He preached, and was raised again by the enthusiastic belief of disciples whose later preaching enveloped the beloved and beautiful Figure with a mirage of miracle. Against this conception Schweitzer brings up the battalions of a century of rationalism, which has assaulted the Gospel story with all sorts of ingeniously discovered discrepancies and improbabilities. What is thus torn to shreds by a more thoroughgoing application of what are supposed to be 'Liberal' principles, Schweitzer would restore by the new interpretation of the secret of Jesus, which he regards as a master-key to the whole problem. But meanwhile there are those who refuse to accept Schweitzer's reconstruction, while they accept the negative conclusions on which he builds, and go comfortably beyond him. We have Mr. J. M. Robertson and the ingenious Professor W. B. Smith, and now Professor Arthur Drews of Jena, proving to us conclusively that Jesus never existed. This hopeful line is even being taken up by popular preachers—at least I assume they are popular, but I have not visited Dundee—who write in the *Hibbert Journal* to show that it really does not matter whether He lived or not, and that, in fact, it is more spiritual to do without the materialistic assumption that the Gospels were meant to be taken as records of real events. I am not going to tarry over this sort of thing. It is possible for the critical faculty to suffer hypertrophy—to enlarge itself at the expense of the historical faculty until any event of the past becomes impossible from the magnifying of its petty difficulties. Sane students will always be able to recognise that the difficulties of any mythical theory are indefinitely greater than any which our Gospels can represent to sober historical criticism.

A few words will suffice to set forth the essence of the eschatological interpretation which Schweitzer preaches with such assurance. It turns on the terms ‘kingdom of God,’ and ‘Son of Man.’ The latter denotes the mysterious figure of the Book of Daniel, which appears on the clouds of heaven to be the minister of judgment. When Jesus took to Himself this title, He was claiming that He was destined to fulfil this prophecy—He Himself should appear on the right hand of Divine Power, coming with the clouds to inaugurate the kingdom of God. That kingdom would not be seen on this side of death. Only on yonder side can be established the Reign in which no evil shall be known. So far we are not likely to quarrel seriously with the exegesis, though we are at liberty to plead that Jesus need not invariably have been looking away from this world when He used these crucial terms. The kingdom of God which is to be received as a little child receives it —which in Paul’s words is ‘righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit’—which has its abode ‘within’ us, or even ‘among’ us, as the less probable rendering has it—this kingdom can hardly be projected into the clouds: it is, at any rate, the illumination of common life down here by a light which streams from an unearthly future. But the real difficulty of the ‘thoroughgoing’ eschatological theory is the extent to which it makes Jesus Himself the subject of an illusion. Without going nearly so far as Schweitzer, we should have to allow that He said the kingdom was coming very soon, before that generation had passed away, during the lifetime of some of those that stood by. We know that the first Christians lived in perpetual expectation of the Parousia, the Royal Advent of Christ, and that Paul wrote nearly all his extant letters in the firm conviction that he himself would not die before the kingdom came. We need not deduce too much from our Lord’s declaration to the Apostles that they would not have gone through the cities of Israel before the Son of Man should come, as if He expected the great event before the disciples could get back from their preaching tour: the ordinary interpretation is quite reasonable. On this assumption we are left with sundry sayings of Jesus which converge on a period many years ahead, but within the lifetime of a few of His disciples, before which period there would be time to proclaim the good news of God's kingdom throughout the Roman world. Such was obviously His own expectation, though He expressly warned His hearers that the very angels did not know the day or the hour, nor even the Son Himself. We note the palpable climax in a saying of uniquely acknowledged authenticity, which claims for Him in all His human self-limitation a dignity higher than men and angels.

Nearly a century after these words were spoken the latest writer in the New Testament Canon was trying to sweeten for his fellow-believers the bitterness of hope deferred. Scoffers were asking with all too obvious reason where was the promise of the Advent, for since the Fathers to whom Christ made that promise fell asleep everything remained just as it had ever been. And to this day, in contented assurance that it cannot come in our time, we are still '*waiting* for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.'

What does it all mean? Does the indefinite postponement of the Day of the Lord, for the hastening of which Jesus flung His life away, shatter the credit of Him of whom every new age tells more clearly that He has words of eternal life? We need not be afraid. After all, the foreshortening of history which made Him see that vivid future so near was only the inevitable condition of the real humanity which He took upon Him. Those who know that pathetically splendid book, George Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, will recall much profound exposition there on the interpretation of symbol in the light of a new age. I will not repeat Tyrrell's thought, but only call attention to one motive which seems to account for the ordering of this ignorance on the part of the Lord in His Incarnate life. Did not the Church's illusion about the Parousia justify by results the Providence that allowed it ? The tremendous sense of urgency that impressed itself upon the early Church proved ultimately the one cause of the triumph of the faith. ' The evangelisation of the world in this generation ' was the motto of the missionary in the first century, even as it is in the twentieth for those who can see visions and dream dreams. And so those who had received their talents went *straightway* and traded with the same, for the King's business required haste. Along all the great roads which Roman wars had made and Roman peace now guarded, the couriers of Christ moved rapidly on from centre to centre, leaving behind them in each one an enthusiastic company of disciples ready to carry the sacred torch through all the country round. Within one generation these centres were established all over the Empire. And all the time the Empire was asleep, never suspecting the advent of ' another Emperor, Jesus,' who, after two and a half centuries of warfare, should take the Caesar captive. Rome might have strangled the Church at its birth had she only known. The methods of Diocletian in the days of Nero might have destroyed Christianity as effectively as the Inquisition destroyed it in Spain long after. But by the time that Rome exchanged her contemptuous tolerance for alarmed activity the Church was too strong to be massacred out of existence. The rapidity with which she grew was the predetermined cause of her survival ; and among the causes of that rapidity we may give a high place to the deep-seated conviction that the speed of evangelisation would be the means of forcing on that kingdom of God for the advent of which every Christian heart yearned. We can see at least partially the reason why the times and seasons are hidden from all real humanity, as such, even when it is the humanity of the Perfect Man.

I want to urge that the view of the purpose of Jesus which the eschatological interpretation forces on us is one that is peculiarly timely for us of the Free Churches to-day. There is a kind of unreasoning optimism which is growing in our midst and is in great need of correction by the essential spirit of the New Testament. An optimist the Christian must be, but it does not follow that he must be optimistic as to the true future of this present world. When we read George Tyrrell we make tacit allowance as Protestants for the pessimism which colours the noble utterance of the lonely thinker who was cast out by his own unworthy Church, and yet loved her lost ideal too well to come over to us, his true spiritual brethren. But we must be pessimists in his sense, after all. We dare not acquiesce in the materialistic conviction that this present world only needs mending, not ending, to make the ideal home for righteousness to dwell in for evermore. Our Christian vocabulary still proclaims that we are strangers and sojourners in a world that is passing away, with the lust thereof, on the way to an Unseen that is eternal. We make our Sunday School children sing hymns which (most unnaturally) express yearning to quit this world for a better land. But I wonder how far we really mean it. We are all of us immensely eager about social reform; and we are convinced that when we have established a more equitable social order and made sweating and over-crowding, unemployment and drink things of the past, there will be a good solid foundation on which the New Jerusalem may descend. Our new Foreign Missionary enthusiasm has frankly dropped the otherworldly motive which drove so many heroic souls to the field half a century ago. We are no longer trying to pull the heathen out of hell-fire; we are trying to give them the blessings of Christian love for this world. Thank God for that!

And yet must we not recognise that there is a subtle peril lest in all these activities we should unconsciously assimilate ourselves to the world around us? The secular reforming enthusiast does not indeed come into competition with the Church on the mission field. If he has an idea of blessing other nations, it hardly goes further than a conviction that magic powers of millennial bliss reside in the importation of the British flag, or in the immediate granting of self-government, according to the shade of his politics. But at home our reformer is sure that the march of science and enlightened administration will in time remove all the blots upon our civilisation—that loyal subjects of Edward the Twelfth will be as much better off than we as we are than those who served Edward the First. Heaven forbid that we should discourage him, or slacken our efforts to further his objects! But it is surely open to question whether the progress that we have ourselves seen in this wonderful generation has advanced so very greatly the happiness of the greatest number. The denizens of Ancoats and Rotherhithe can now exchange visits by aeroplane, but the interesting possibility makes small difference to the dismal conditions of their lives. Motors are a glorious invention, but the village child gets nothing from them except the ruin of his only playground. Even the beneficent triumphs of medicine and surgery need to be qualified by the remembrance of the suffering and hardship to which the healed toiler returns from the peace and luxury of the hospital. Nor is our question limited to the condition of the poor: the rich themselves, who can use to the full the new resources of civilisation, have gained little in that which makes for their lasting happiness. They may be flying down a country road on a Sunday morning instead of declaring themselves miserable sinners in church, but the improvement is equivocal, after all.

I hope my concrete instances will not appear cynical, or cast doubts on my own enthusiasm for progress:

I shall try to show presently how we may believe in progress, and yet subordinate it to a higher law. I only want to insist that we have no sufficient grounds for believing that material progress will ever cleanse the Augean stable of this world, or even of this enlightened England, sufficiently to make it a site for the Heavenly City of our faith. Even material considerations prove to us that earth is not and cannot be an abiding city. However marvellously science may increase the productivity of the soil, or devise unheard-of resources for feeding the multitudes upon the surface of this little planet, the day must surely come when Mother Earth can no longer provide for her brood. And before that day there may drift into our solar system—as almost yearly there comes to some other star away in the depths of the heavens—the dark burnt-out sun that lies like a derelict wreck in the ocean, ready to crash into our luminary as it sweeps through space, and cause in literal truth the heavens for us to catch fire and be dissolved, and the earth and the works that are therein to vanish more suddenly than even the apocalyptist dreamed. Surely, however certain we may be that the catastrophe is not likely to be in our time, still more certain that the threatened famine on an overcrowded earth will not come for ages, not perhaps till the very cooling of the sun brings disaster from another quarter yet, we are bound to confess that our race is a race of sojourners after all. Must not the theist go on to argue that God has some better place than an earthly paradise to be the home of His perfected creation ?

I need not develop this argument further, or spend time on the proof which comes from our study of facts that lie deeper than material conditions. Do we really see reason to hope that centuries hence the Church herself will have fully learnt the meaning of the simple commandment which forms the whole code of the kingdom of heaven—that we must love God utterly, and our neighbour as much as ourselves ? And suppose that in all her members the Church is practising that code in the face of the world—will human nature here be so changed as to yield without a struggle to the appeal ? Will the ape and the tiger have died in man, and Borgias and Leopolds cease to flourish ? I can find no warrant for such an optimism in Christian prophecy, nor in any promises that scientific sociology may hold out. Even if such a Golden Age should dawn, we could only ask why a hard fate compelled those Borgias and Leopolds to be born in an age which had none of the magnetic force that might drag them into righteousness. The kingdom of God would stand for the future ; but its golden streets would only imperfectly hide the blood and shame and tears of men whose damnation it was that they were born a few millennia or hundreds of millennia too soon. Not by such a heaven could the ways of God to men be finally justified beyond appeal.

I venture to think, therefore, that by the help of a 'blasphemous book,' by an argument which seems to strike at our most cherished convictions about Him after whose name we dare to call ourselves, we are being called to a re-assertion of the Catholic Christology, and of the Christian Hope which has lived before the saints of every age. Catholic, I say, and I use the much-abused word in its true sense ; for even the Roman and Greek Churches hold the great doctrine which has been for centuries the inspiration of Evangelical Protestantism—the doctrine that Jesus of Nazareth was Very God, and His death was not merely the most wonderful and pathetic of martyrdoms, but the climax of an obedience which made atonement for the sin of the whole world. 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus' leads us through many strange and devious paths ; but it does at any rate end before the 'green hill far away,' where hangs—these are Schweitzer's words—'the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose.' He accepted, nay insisted on death, Schweitzer declares, that He might force forward the Divine event which was to bring eternal life to men. ' That is His victory and His reign.'

And the Christian Hope, the place of which in the centre of our religion has been emphasised afresh by this new and greatly daring school of thought—how does that stand toward our enthusiasms of to-day ? I said just now that we of the Evangelical Free Churches peculiarly need the reminder. The pious Roman may cherish his pessimist outlook on the world within the cloister where he has buried himself for thought and prayer. We have no place for the cloister in our creed. We fervently believe that God has given us our place in the thick of the fight, and we are assured, like Socrates of old, that it were unutterable shame for us to desert our post and flee. But, fighting as we are side by side with earnest men whose outlook is on this world only, and their hope in a progress that shall bring peace on earth, we are in great danger of confounding our ideal with theirs. Beyond all other men we need to be otherworldly, heavenly-minded, our treasure laid up in the place where no moth or rust doth consume, and no demon of disillusionment breaks in to steal our life's hope. We need not fear that otherworldliness will make us less eager for the mending of this world. We fight against fleshly lusts because they ' war against the soul '—the one part of man that is meant to see the kingdom of God, and therefore is beyond any exchanging with treasures that this world can give. We strive to destroy sweating and swilling, because such environments make it so fearfully difficult for a human spirit to be made ready for service in the realm of light. We preach the Gospel to the heathen, because it will give them a mighty uplift towards that holiness without which none shall see the Lord. We can toil on and not be disheartened when we see good causes fail and the wicked triumphant. It is hard for a patriot to see his country slipping down the hill—to listen to deluded panicmongers preaching a devil's doctrine of war and preparation for war, incapable of realising what a national decadence their crusade involves. The Christian fights against such pestilent delusions with all his soul, but he knows that if Ichabod be written on the page of Britain's future, God can save the world even without the nation that has been so virile in the past. He does not know, and knows he does not know, how long the interval which separates him from the heaven of his hope. But be the interim long or short, his daily conduct is determined by the call to live worthily of his franchise in the City of God. The perspective of life is determined by a vanishing point fixed far away and yet very near: as with Browning's Lazarus, the trifles become momentous and the great things small. And beyond all other duties, overwhelmingly peremptory in its urgency and distinctness, sounds the call that bids him not 'be saved alone,' but by all means win some to be his comrades in the vaster service of the kingdom on high. It is not yet made manifest what he will be, nor when. But with those who have fellowship with him in the blessed hope he waits on God's good time; and in a world of enemies knows his fellows by the watchword in the language of Canaan—Maranatha, 'Our Lord cometh,' with its echo 'Our Lord, come!' These things are high and holy, and we know how far we are below our ideal. But we have our hope set on the Son of Man, to whom all authority is given in heaven and on earth, and in that Beatific Vision we purify ourselves even as He is pure.

BISHOP WESTCOTT[1]

A VERY large public will welcome the early appearance of the life of a saint and a man of genius who has left his own peculiar mark in many places upon our country's later annals. As my father's close friend and fellow-worker through nearly thirty years, and more particularly as Regius Professor at Cambridge and Fellow of my own College, Dr. Westcott's personality was very familiar to me, and an object of profound reverence and affection. My own personal reminiscences will add little to the picture of the great teacher, but they will help in various ways to determine the lines on which, in the present article, I may try to characterise the book dedicated to his memory.

The industry and the modesty which Mr. Arthur Westcott has brought to his labour of love will be soon apparent to those who even glance over these nine hundred pages. Mr. Westcott alludes in his preface to a sentence of advice given to him as a boy by his father: 'Build solidly, and don't stuff up holes with putty.' He modestly hopes that the putty has been good, honest putty with which he has bound together the 'more solid matter supplied by others' for his biography. Most of his readers will, I think, wish that the author had been more generous with his 'putty.' Dr. Westcott's letters, which fill a very large proportion of these pages, are often sorely in need of a little commentary: allusions which were no doubt quite clear to the correspondent are difficult for us. And if it be not treason to say it, the letters do not represent the man as some men's letters do. There is, of course, a great deal that is interesting, and self-revealing too, to those who know the writer in other ways. But there are few subjects on which his opinions could not be better sought in some one of his published writings, where they would be found set forth in his own characteristic literary style, which contrasts rather markedly with the abrupt conciseness of his familiar letters. There are letters included in this biography which approach more nearly to the style of his books—letters in which he is setting himself to expound some great doctrine to an inquirer, or to remove some difficulty of belief. A study of the letters of so profound a thinker and so great a master of pure and beautiful English would be a profitable exercise for a student of St. Paul's letters, in the light of Deissmann's instructive essay on the differences between letters and epistles.[1] But I am digressing. The often tantalising incompleteness of the letters, as a manifestation of the man who wrote them, seems to me to call for more characterisation on the part of the biographer. Many will feel that the appreciations at the end, by Mr. Thomas Burt and Mr. Boutflower—both most ably written, and the latter showing altogether exceptional insight—bring the great Bishop more vividly before the reader's mind than anything else in the book. I wish his son had given us more on the same lines, gathering together from the most intimate knowledge the features of his father's life and thought. I should like to have heard more of his methods of study, to have been vouchsafed some glimpses of the workshop whence issued such an amazing output of concentrated thought. And I should have welcomed a few pages to present more fully the secret of the father's influence in his own family. To how few men, comparable with Westcott in genius and in character, has it been given to see every son—and Westcott had seven—deliberately choose the path in life which the father trod, when there was no worldly advantage to determine the choice! The beauty and attractiveness of goodness, a strength of conviction too deep-seated to think of pleading for the truth, but presenting truth ever in its most winsome form, as the inseparable spirit of a man—this was what we saw in the great scholar whose friendship we were privileged to share; and a fuller portraiture of such a man in his own home would have had a very special helpfulness and charm.

---

[1] *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Durham.* By his son, Arthur Westcott. Two vols. London: Macmillan, 1903.

---

[1] *Bible Studies*, pp. 3-59.

With this criticism—if criticism it be to ask for more of a gift that is good already—let me pass on from the book to its subject.[1] A scholar's life rarely has much incident to show, and this is no exception. We read in the account of his school days that Westcott was originally destined for Exeter College, Oxford: his transference to Trinity was almost an accident. What a difference that accident made both to him and to Cambridge! He became a supreme example of the Cambridge ideal of scholarship,[2] and Cambridge in her turn gratefully owned him as her most influential leader. From Trinity he went to Harrow for eighteen years. One can hardly help regretting that so many years were spent in work which was always against the grain. Westcott, of course, profoundly influenced a select few, and was prized at his true worth by his colleagues. But he was no disciplinarian, and could not make himself either heard or understood by the mass of the boys when he preached in chapel. The work was done with absolute thoroughness, but he yearned for release as no born schoolmaster could have done, and time that might have been used to purpose in a fitter sphere was lavished on schoolboys' composition. At last, at forty-five, he was Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. The year that saw his removal thither found him seated at the Revisers' Board in the Jerusalem Chamber. The Revised New Testament and the Westcott and Hort Greek Testament appeared almost simultaneously in 1881. The great Cambridge trio, Westcott, Lightfoot, Hort—surely the most powerful group of scholars that ever adorned the theological faculty within a few years in any university in the world—had by this time lost to the see of Durham the first of its costly gifts to ecclesiastical administration. Westcott followed his friend thither in 1890, and two years later Hort died. Eleven years of extraordinary success in the great Northern see made the most jealous partisans of scholarship acknowledge that the new sphere was worthy of Westcott's powers. In 1901, while our Conference was sitting in the neighbouring city of Newcastle, he passed to the Church triumphant, leaving behind him works of astonishing variety, but all of them harmonious contributions towards one great end. 'He edited the Greek New Testament: he settled the Coal Strike.' Where is the scholar whose epitaph might include two such items as its most typical features?

---

[1] In the hope that a re-issue will be called for, the following details of 'lower criticism' may be of service. Vol. i. p. 53, *φθονέοντες* surely should be *φθονοῦντες*? Pages 84 and 93, 'Hadyn' is apparently for 'Haydn.' Page 103, Pascal has a superfluous *h*. Page 131, 'Jemmed' is a comical word, and so is 'vicacious,' page 142. On page 194 'Becker's text' needs altering. Vol. ii. p. 80, query 'to deprec*i*ate Hooker.' Page 161, if the Bishop really wrote *ἄθλον* I may put it beside the *ἦρεν* which I once triumphantly found in the Westcott-Hort Greek Testament. But the printer probably was responsible. Page 225, footnote, read 'Bevölker*u*ng.' Page 378, near the bottom: 'historial' needs correcting. In the letter about my father's death, page 300, should not the last sentence be 'I remain, the *oldest* of all'? This fits the facts, and was what Dr. Westcott said in his appreciation of my father in the *Methodist Times*.

[2] Cf. his brief exposition of 'the Cambridge motto: "I act, therefore I am."' (*Life*, vol. ii., p. 328.)

My own most intimate knowledge of Dr. Westcott begins with my entrance at King's College in 1882. He had recently been elected a Professorial Fellow, and he greatly appreciated his connection with the College. With his keen artistic feeling, he must have taken peculiar delight in the great Chapel, the building to which Wordsworth addressed his famous sonnet, and in which Milton doubtless conceived the yet more famous lines in *Il Penseroso* on the

> . . . high embowèd roof,
> With antic pillars massy proof,
> And storied windows richly dight,
> Casting a dim religious light.

The intellectual record of the College had been in recent years exceedingly high. Alone among Cambridge Colleges, King's does not admit men reading for the 'ordinary degree.' The restriction gives obvious advantages to those who are eager to get all they can from the University. But Westcott saw another side, fearing (with some reason, I think) that the College might become an 'intellectual aristocracy,' as he put it to my father. I remember vividly the Sunday afternoon meetings of King's men in the rooms of Professor Ryle.[1] The procedure was slightly changed in my time from that described [2] by Mr. Inge, who was a little my senior. One of us was regularly put on to read a ten minutes' paper. (How much harder most of us would have found it to read a paper in Dr. Westcott's presence when maturer years had come!) I was the victim twice, and on the first occasion cheerfully undertook to give an account of Methodism within the allotted time. It was amusing to see the interest and curiosity of my fellow-undergraduates, to whom I spoke like a traveller from Tibet. I had to stand fire for nearly an hour, explaining to the best of my power the difference between a class-leader and an archdeacon, and answering other questions betraying greater or less degrees of ignorance. Westcott's *obiter dicta* were deeply interesting, showing as they did his characteristic power of sympathetic insight into the religious position of Free Churchmen, an insight so distressingly rare in even the best men of his communion. I had some notes of them once, but I sadly fear they repose at the bottom of the last drawer I shall open in search of them, and I must be content with one which I remember. I had been emphasising our doctrine of the priesthood, and Westcott remarked that if we believed all Christians to be priests we ought to have an ordination service for them. A letter to his biographer son when at school[1] illustrates his meaning. 'Confirmation . . . is a kind of Christian ordination, with its consecration and its blessing.' If we Methodists took kindly to ritual, no doubt the service for the recognition of new members would have done something in the direction of Dr. Westcott's suggestion.

---

[1] Now—unfortunately for Cambridge and for Biblical scholarship—Bishop of Winchester.

[2] Vol. i. p. 409.

Dr. Westcott's lectures are another very vivid memory. I was not reading theology, and therefore had to take them as a luxury, to be indulged in when my own Tripos lectures allowed. The courses I attended were thronged by men who received certificates of attendance, in view of bishops' requirements at ordination. At the back of the big room could generally be seen a few embryo priests of a style which is not unfamiliar at the seminaries of sound learning and religious education. These worthies, being absolutely incapable of following the lecture, would play cards or read novels, and secure some more intelligent friend's notes afterwards to copy. Once Westcott stopped abruptly in his lecture and fixed the back bench with wrath in his eye. Gathering up his gown, he strode down to the door, and presently we saw a big undergraduate towering above the little Professor and looking about as thoroughly withered as a man could do. In a minute or two the door opened, the hopes of a certificate vanished sullenly down the stairs, the Professor came back to his desk, and we resumed our note taking. The incident will serve as a companion to the solitary instance of Westcott's powers of wrath narrated in the *Life*,[2] which made his son ever after believe in the story that Edward I. once killed a man by looking at him. A little less severe restraint upon this faculty would have done away with his disciplinary failure as a schoolmaster. But his University lectures were themselves sufficient proof that he lacked a still more important qualification for teaching boys. Delivered though they were to about three hundred undergraduates, a large proportion of them Poll-men, they were phrased as if addressed to a roomful of Professors. To epitomise in long-hand a lecture every sentence of which was an epigram was an intellectual exercise which made my head ache when, as happened one term, Dr. Westcott wound up a morning in which I had been taking notes strenuously from nine till twelve. But it was worth the headache.

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 345.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 351.

Mental pictures of Westcott during those Cambridge days are abundant. One could not help watching him whenever he was in view ; there was always something to repay observation, like a mountain panorama over which the clouds and the mist and the sunlight bring perpetual change of beauty. The far-away look of contemplation would be succeeded by the eager glance of lively interest as the swift mind came back suddenly to some topic of serious conversation. Or the drawn features and look of pain, as he dwelt on the sorrows and sins of men, so real to him, would be chased away by that wonderful smile, a smile the like of which I never saw and never expect to see. Various typical visions of him recur to my memory. In his Professor's stall at St. Mary's, with his head resting on his gloved hand, the glove an ancient friend, and his eyes closed in deep thought—a shocking example to those whose closed eyes during a sermon had not always the same purpose behind them. Hurrying down Trumpington Street on his way to lecture, with armful of books, and gown streaming in the wind. At The Leys, when the study door has opened at last after the strenuous four hours of a winter afternoon spent on the revision of *Wisdom* or *Second Maccabees*, and he and Hort and my father have emerged with a merry laugh like schoolboys let out of a lesson; then the grey shawl is wrapped tightly round him, and he hurries down the drive—he always seemed to hurry, for life was too busy to allow time to loiter on the road. In our Combination Room at King's, when the annual Fellows' Meeting was dragging its slow length along, silent by the window, doing his duty by the details of College farms unlet and agricultural depression reducing our living to plainer and plainer standards, no doubt the better to heighten our thinking. In the great court before the Senate House, on the memorable Women's Degrees Day, having travelled from Durham to give a *non placet* vote,[1] but sheltering himself on the library side among us *placets*, and escaping thereby the eggs and confetti with which the undergraduates outside were vainly trying to reach the unpopular party. Or, impressive beyond all, at Hort's funeral, standing wistfully at the head of the open grave which was to hide from him his life-long fellow-worker, and from the world a genius equal to his own.

But it is time to leave these desultory reminiscences, and turn to the biography for some lights on the varied personality of its subject. I say 'varied,' but I do not suggest that Westcott's mind was one of those which possess an uninterrupted outlook towards all the points of the compass alike. The windows were all on one side, and they gave only one aspect of the manifold interests of human life; but what they lacked in variety of aspect they made up for in clearness and intensity of vision, and there were few phenomena that escaped their penetration.[2] His character belonged to that class which is always associated with the highest type of man. Intense seriousness was its unvarying mood; vivid imagination its most potent faculty. 'Imagination' is not a happy word, for it suggests that unrealities may have assumed concrete existence with him. I use it as the nearest word that secular language gives for faith, the power of seeing vividly those great unseen realities to which multitudes are totally blind, and which multitudes more see only like phantoms in a dream. Those clear, intense, blue eyes were emblems of the mental vision with which the facts of thought and spirit lived before him all his life. So real were they that he found it impossible to find time for objects which seemed frivolous to one whose motto was always St. Paul's, 'One thing I do.' Not that he was incapable of unbending. His letters show plenty of genial lightness, and there are sometimes traces of humour. But he never could understand amusements, and his very recreations were serious, except when he played with children. Botany was a hobby he shared with his friend Hort, and with that prince among Orientalists, E. B. Cowell, the last of the great men Cambridge has lost in recent years. If poetry is to be called a recreation, he carried his characteristic seriousness into that field as into others. We read with amazement his estimate of Keble. Thus[1]:

---

[1] He thought that there should be a separate university for women, and that it was dangerous to force their studies into the lines already fixed for the men. See *Life*, vol. ii. p. 295.

[2] I have been reminded, since writing, of a witty dean who said: 'How foggy it is to-day: Westcott must have opened his windows.' I stick to my own use of the illustration, however: I do not believe there was ever 'fog' in *his* outlook.

> Keble—Wordsworth—Goethe. Is not the first the true poet . . . ?

In the same year[2] (*ætat.* twenty-three),

> After all, a verse of Keble is worth volumes of Tennyson.

Literary judgment was thus overborne in his youth by religious feeling. A slightly later letter[3] contains the admission that he had not found his ideal poet.

> The Christian poet is yet to be seen, for I never will accord Milton the name.

Why is not explained, for he has already quoted a devotional passage from Oliver Cromwell with high appreciation, and Puritanism can hardly, therefore, have been the cause of his dislike. Was it Milton's Arianism which prejudiced him, in days when the large-minded toleration of mature life had not yet arisen to soften the outlines of religious barriers? Even in 1866 he could write [1]

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 51. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 100. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

> *Ecce Homo* I saw on Lightfoot's table for a few minutes. You will imagine that I felt its defects far more than its merits.

The remarks which follow show that a defective view of our Lord's Person was in his eyes enough to outweigh all else, however stimulating and true within its limitations. Such jealousy for the cardinal truths no doubt limited his appreciation of much that was of the highest value, but it was the secret of his peculiar power. His friend Hort was much more open-minded, but for that very reason would have been a less effective advocate of what they both so intensely believed.

The *Life* gives us very little of Westcott's opinions on matters of classical and Biblical scholarship. A classical teacher will read with sympathy his words about the study of authors without notes: [2] the multiplication of editions has hardly left us a single book wherein a student may work out his own problems. It is amusing to see his early protestations of hatred towards trifles of grammar and orthography, which he would have liked to sweep out of the way, in an introductory note to the 'W.-H.' Greek Testament, reserving serious criticism for variants of greater moment. Perhaps Hort converted him: in any case, the minute fidelity with which the editors reproduce even the spelling of the great MSS. has been an invaluable help to students who have in the last few years been tracing many interesting facts about the New Testament Greek, through the newly discovered vernacular of Greek-speaking Egypt. A remark, many years later,[1] that ‘ there certainly is a wonderful disregard of grammar in these latter days,’ presumably shows his maturer feeling. Apart from one or two scattered allusions, the great work of nearly thirty years on the text of the Greek Testament hardly figures in these volumes till the time comes for chronicling its publication. So with the Revision, on the details of which Westcott makes hardly any comment. Once he nearly throws up the work in despair, because the conservative majority would insist on spoiling St. John i. This letter [2] specially interests me, as I fixed on that very chapter [3] to show how often the views of the very best scholars in the Revision Company were found in the margin only, overruled by the prejudice in favour of the old version. In 1871 he writes with most refreshing candour about the action of the bishops, who seem to have gone back on their original treaty, on the strength of which the Companies were formed.

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 289.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

> I had thought over every kind of treacherous manœuvre, but repudiation had not occurred to me. Can it really be that principles of honour die out in Churchmen ? It is a terrible spectacle for our enemies. . . . How bishops can forget honour I cannot understand.[4]

Westcott really seems to have been on the highroad towards the shocking sentiment which Stanley once expressed to my father, that he had never known a man who did not deteriorate after he had once put on lawn sleeves. Happily, the Cambridge group—two of whom were destined to prove that Stanley's rule had exceptions—made ‘ indignant protests against the breach of faith,’ and their lordships kindly allowed the Revision to proceed, as it probably would have done if they had stuck to their guns.

Dr. Westcott's views on Old Testament criticism peep out once or twice. He will not accept the responsibility of deciding matters outside his own *métier*, but indicates clearly that he was no foe to a free but reverent literary criticism. It is interesting to find him, in 1885, writing[1]:

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 166.

[2] Vol. i. p. 397.

[3] *Life of William F. Moulton*, p. 190.

[4] Vol. i. pp. 394, 395.

> I do not think that any one in England has done better or more helpful work on the Old Testament than Dr. Cheyne.

What would the Bishop have said to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*—to the exquisite humours of the Jerahmeel monomania, or the delightful transformation of Iscariot from a 'thief' to a 'cross-grained fellow' (χαλεπός)?

Naturally the biography is specially strong where the Bishop's works are much less explicit, in points of ecclesiastical convictions and policy. We read with mixed feelings the letter to his future wife,[2] in which he hopes that the books he sends will further her being 'gathered again to that Church which is the object of' his own 'devotion.' Had Miss Whittard remained a Wesleyan, Westcott told her that he would always 'feel a sincere interest in' her 'happiness and welfare, both in this world and in the world to come.' We may agree that Westcott could hardly have married a convinced member of our own church: his own type of piety, with all its breadth and catholicity, was always that which finds its natural sustenance in the surroundings of Episcopacy. But not even in this letter, written at nineteen, is there any trace of bitterness or prejudice against another Christian communion. He was alive to many of the special advantages of our Church system: witness his strong desire[3] (at twenty-three) to engraft a primitive diaconate—'in some degree like the "local preachers"'—upon the uncongenial stem of the Anglican Church, which in this 'one thing' has 'changed from the primitive custom.' Against his early acceptance of Apostolical Succession[4] and depreciation of the Evangelical school because it makes preaching 'the chief means of grace,' which 'must lead to the exaltation of the individual minister,' we may set the wise words of more than fifty years later, in a letter to Mr. Llewelyn Davies [1]:

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 45.

[2] Vol. i. p. 33.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

> I cannot find any basis for the High Church theory in the New Testament. It is based, as far as I can see, on assumed knowledge of what the divine plan must be. I had occasion to look through the New Testament not long ago with special reference to the question, and I was greatly impressed by a fact which seems to have been overlooked. All the apostolic writers are possessed (as I think rightly in essence) by the thought of the Lord's return. They show no sign of any purpose to create a permanent ecclesiastical organisation. Whatever is done is to meet a present need, as, *e.g.*, the mission of Titus to Crete. The very condition laid down for the Apostolate excludes the idea of the perpetuation of their office. Is not this true? What followed when the Lord (as I think) did come is a wonderful revelation of the providence of God.

Golden words, to be written in our copies of Lightfoot's *Christian Ministry* and Hort's *Christian Ecclesia*, for use in time of need! With the three greatest scholars of the English Established Church on our side, we can afford to smile at the pretensions of High Anglicanism. I cannot resist one more quotation [2]:

> I am fully satisfied by the testimony of others as to the remarkable work which —— has done, and as to the influence which he is able to exercise by his presentation of the Gospel. Yet I cannot but doubt whether in the end a teacher can bring permanent blessing to others as long as he is obviously deficient in the elementary graces of humility, meekness, and obedience. After all, these are the graces which are least conspicuous in our own communion, and it seems to me to be the duty of us all, at whatever cost, when the opportunity is given, to show how highly we rate them.

This passage might be paralleled by several others from the period of Westcott's episcopate dealing with those persons of curious consciences who 'forget their ordination promises' and are 'Roman in heart and policy.'[1] No Protestant could better the language he uses about Transubstantiation[2] and Reservation[3] ('can it be Christian in conception?'); and his early sentiments about Rome[4] suffer no weakening as life goes on. As an undergraduate he was 'beginning to feel a growing abhorrence of her principles': as a septuagenarian bishop he finds Lord Halifax's 'utterances fill' him 'almost with despair.' The remark about Rome's barrenness in poetry may be quoted[5]:

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 306.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

> It is strange that there has been no great Romanist poet. Why not, when the papal system admits every addition of art and encourages every kind of symbolism and mystic interpretation? Can it be that she loves neither simplicity nor freedom?—I will not say truth.

The obvious exception of Dante is just one of those exceptions which prove a rule.

It would be easy to enlarge indefinitely the quotations from the part of this *Life* which adds most to our knowledge of the great Bishop. His views on Church Reform;[6] on the Articles as a test;[7] on the higher education of the clergy[8]:

> More and more am I convinced that the work of the Church must be done at the Universities—nay, at Cambridge. It is too late to shape men afterwards, even if they could be reached;

on the Anglican recognition of the Vaudois[9] (an unhappy decision, as it cannot but seem to us); on the 'very small place which the clergy occupy in the history of England'[10]—all these, and many others, are seen scattered through the two volumes in brief allusions which tantalise us by their scantiness. In his letters, as in his books, Westcott always expects his reader to expand for himself his brief suggestive hints, which, had they been expanded every one, the tomes of Augustine himself would hardly have contained the books that would have been written.

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 302. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 49, 79, 80, 351. [3] *Ibid.*, 274, 356.

[4] Vol. i. pp. 91, 95. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 156. [6] Vol. ii. pp. 249, 251.

[7] See vol. i. p. 99, where he expresses 'great joy' that he was not compelled to assent to the Articles on taking his degree, as he could not give it then. Declaration of membership of the Church of England was substituted.

[8] Vol. i. p. 292. [9] Vol. ii. p. 53. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 231.

On the social side of Westcott's life work much could be written. The transformation of the great scholar, at sixty-five, into 'everybody's Bishop,' in a teeming Northern population, was a very remarkable phenomenon, though not perhaps so remarkable as some people outside Cambridge have thought; for in Cambridge—and very probably in Oxford also—there are always a good many men who follow, with tolerable intelligence and knowledge, the course of events in the outside world; and though the purely 'academic' man and the unpractical theorist can be found there as elsewhere, the knowledge of social phenomena and the resolute study of social problems are as often features of the don as of the business man—perhaps even more often. I say these things with bated breath, but as to their truth for Westcott there can be no doubt at all. The mystical scholar, the foremost devotee of 'dead languages,' found his way to the heart of the Durham pitman, and proved that he knew as much and cared as much about the affairs of common life as if he had never learnt the Greek alphabet. Of course, this is not really surprising, though such things do surprise many people. The scholar may be obfuscated by his learning, just as the 'practical man' may be hardened by his business. But if only by the grace of God each of them can be a *man*, each will find his own special pursuits a great help in his efforts to work out the salvation of his fellows. Given the eagerness to learn, the brains which so swiftly apprehended the lesson, and the spiritual fervour which inspired every effort, Bishop Westcott probably won these simple folk mainly because he was so unlike them. When I was a freshman there was an ever memorable mission in Cambridge, held by Messrs. Moody and Sankey. One who knew the undergraduate would have predicted that the homely style and the American accent were fatal to Moody's success; a refined University man would be the one to move him. On the contrary, the converts among the 'men' were numbered by hundreds, and the part taken by Cambridge in founding the great Student Volunteer Missionary movement really dates from that week. The converse clearly held in Westcott's case. The magic of sympathy can bridge any gulf, and the mere fact that he spoke so different a language from their own arrested the attention and won the heart. It was very manifestly his theology which gave him this intense interest in the out-of-church life of the people. The Incarnation was for him the centre of all truth; and the fact that the Son of God became a Man hallowed every part of man's mental and moral and social life, so that nothing human was foreign to the realm of his religion. Westcott was not peculiar in his doctrine, but he held it as a saint and not merely as a thinker. It was so intensely real to him that it coloured every thought, and was a decisive element in every problem. To divide life into watertight compartments, to parcel out the sacred and the secular, was impossible to him; for along every path of life he saw One walking whose form was human yet divine. We all believe with our heads that He is disguised beneath the worn features of men and women whom we could help. Westcott believed it with his heart as well, and that is all.

A few of his views on social and political questions may be briefly set down here. We naturally look for his thoughts on the drink curse. He 'was himself a teetotaler because of the present necessity,'[1] but he seems to have thought that pure beer in moderation, with wine and spirits rigidly excluded,[2] was a practicable ideal. In a letter to my father,[1] dated January 3, 1896, he says:

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 178.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

> We all missed you greatly at the Temperance Conference.[2] The Prohibitionists once more showed themselves to be unstatesmanlike and impracticable. Yet the whole effect will have been good.

The long letter to the Secretary of the County Brewers' Society,[3] dated November 1893, betrays a touching faith in the brewers' interest in temperance. The Prohibitionists, whose 'impracticable' temper he deplored, were in the flesh before him; the good philanthropic brewers to whom he wrote were idealised by his characteristic 'persistence in assuming the best of men.' As Mr. Boutflower continues, in that singularly penetrating appreciation to which I have already referred,[4] 'morally his optimism was, as regards men, extraordinary, and amounted to a practical danger as well as a spiritual power.'

In politics, as ordinarily understood, Westcott took no very striking line. His opinions were coloured by his ecclesiastical surroundings to a greater extent here than elsewhere. He thought the Church had 'most rightly settled' the Deceased Wife's Sister.[5] He sighed over the Irish Church [6] and the perverse effort of those 'grievously provoking Welsh Liberals' to disestablish the Anglican Church in Wales.[7] We find that in 1901 Archbishop Temple

> has become a convert to sound views on the Education question, and there is really hope that something may be done.[8]

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 238.

[2] This was a meeting of Christian leaders of all Churches, called together to see how far concerted action was possible. It was originated by the Rev. H. B. Workman, who secured a meeting between Bishop Jayne, my father, and others, to prepare for a conference on a larger scale. Returning from Manchester after this consultation, my father was seized with an attack which too truly foreshadowed his sudden death three years later. See his *Life*, pp. 274-278.

[3] Vol. ii. p. 218.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 364.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

[6] Vol. i. p. 294.

[7] Vol. ii. pp. 171, 216.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 335.

Something *was* done! And yet I think Westcott would have listened with sympathy and surprise had my father been spared to tell him what that 'something' meant for the Free Churches. The idea of dragooning men or beguiling children into 'the' Church away from the faith of their fathers was absolutely foreign to his nature. It was only his optimism again. He believed in the tolerance of the clergy, just as he believed in the temperance zeal of the brewer.

His line upon certain questions that have but lately ceased to burn needs no particular description. He figures, in vol. ii., at an international arbitration congress, but that was not in 1899. It goes without saying that his eyes were on 'our imperial obligations,' rather than on the less lovely objects which roused the patriot in the street; and his native fairness is well shown in his letter to a pleader for peace:[1]

> You cannot condemn the Jameson Raid more sternly than I do. I do not think that I ever felt more anxious till it became clear that the English people would not be led away (like the Poet Laureate) by the false romance of the attack. And again, you cannot shrink more than I do from a man like Mr. Rhodes. But the causes of the war lie deeper.

Neither on this nor on any other subject does he seem to have spoken in the Lords, though he dutifully attended, especially when there was an Indian debate, from which he thought 'a bishop ought not to be absent.'[2] It is amusing to read:

> Having listened to the Duke of Devonshire for about half an hour, I felt that I wanted a change.[3]

We return by a gentle transition to the subjects on which any notice of Bishop Westcott must begin and end. The application of Christianity to morals will be finely seen in his letters on theatre-going[1] and gambling,[2] which, for all their brevity, will be valued by all who look for weighty words with which to guide men on these questions. And I should not like to pass over the charming address to the 'Dicky-Bird Society,' in which he speaks in the simplest language to children on the duty of kindness to all living things.[3] We seek his guidance on Sunday observance, and find it different indeed from that view which prevails in the Romanising part of his own communion.[4] It reminds me of his remarks in the undergraduates' Sunday afternoon at King's, already described: he told us that he always liked to make a difference between Sunday and other days, even to the extent of using a different Greek Testament. It was typical of a life in which the holy never alternated with the profane, but only with the holy in a different binding.

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 311.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 316.

To depict the features of Westcott's saintliness is a task one would fain leave to other hands, for only the saint can catch the sure lines of a saintly character. But to pass over that which alone interprets the man would indeed be stripping the biography of its meaning; and there is no difficulty in finding material for the estimate, except the difficulty of choice. We find him taking *In His Steps* for a railway journey, and recording his approval in words which might have put to silence some of the foolish things said about that book at the time of its extraordinary popularity.[5] Theological critics would very possibly account for Westcott's judgment by saying that Mr. Sheldon, like himself, placed the Incarnation in the central place, which should be taken by the Atonement. Whether this be so or not, we can immediately feel that the story puts in popular form what was always the motive power of Westcott's spiritual life. His was one of those 'naturally Christian' souls, for whom the imitation of Christ takes from the first the place belonging to the

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 297.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 183.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 282.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 303.

Cross in the hearts of those who have known a great religious upheaval. His clergy used to say of him, 'The Bishop does not seem to believe in the Fall.'[1] I need not say that all this was unconscious with him. I do not imagine that his theological theory would have allowed either *Paradise Lost* or *Paradise Regained* to take a second place to any other doctrine.[2] But his mind was ever dwelling on the fact of the Incarnation, which inspired all his vivid realisation of the dignity of humanity and its infinite destiny. He held, as is well known, the view that the Incarnation was in the essence of God's plan: the Fall demanded the Atonement, but the Incarnation would have been needed even by unfallen man to enable him, born in God's image, to attain God's likeness. I have dwelt again on this cardinal point of Westcott's theology, because without it his own character and religious life could not be understood. There are saintly men whose goodness seems almost independent of their doctrine; they startle us by showing at one moment an easy open-mindedness to things which seem to us essential, and then without apparent consciousness of transition pass to manifestations of pure religion and undefiled which prove that the eleventh of Hebrews was written of them as surely as of any hero of the olden day. Westcott was very different. We have a few hints in his letters that he suffered severely in young manhood from assaults of scepticism. Had he emerged from that period with his faith in 'Jesus Christ come in the flesh' undermined, or weakened, his biography would probably have been written, but with some strangely different title, and with the whole story transformed. The victory of faith, won gradually—if we may judge from the silence of his letters—and not at one moment of regenerating illumination, made it the occupation and satisfaction of his life 'to behold the beauty of Jehovah and to inquire in His temple.' The note of

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 365.

[2] Readers will not forget his book on *The Victory of the Cross*.

beauty recurs constantly in the harmonies of religion as it appealed to him. One recalls his comment on the adjective in John x. 14:

> Christ is not only the true shepherd (ὁ π. ὁ ἀληθινός) who fulfils the idea of the shepherd, but He is the good shepherd who fulfils the idea in its attractive loveliness. The epithet implies the correspondence between the nobility of the conception and the beauty of the realisation. The 'good' is not only good inwardly (ἀγαθός) but good as perceived (καλός). In the fulfilment of His work 'the Good Shepherd' claims the admiration of all that is generous in man.

In His light he saw light everywhere around him. Human 'flesh,' which was accounted worthy to enshrine the presence of the Eternal Son, had not lost the lines of the divine image, and the beauty of human thought and human art was the outshining of a glory which was revealed in its ideal perfection when awe-struck men listened to words such as never man had spoken, when wondering apostles beheld 'human lineaments . . . shine irradiant with a light divine.' It is easy to see how solitary meditation at night in the old cathedral at Peterborough was meat and drink to his soul. His passionate love of sacred architecture rose from profound realisation of the Godward thoughts that the builders of old strove to embody in stone; and the communion of saints was intensely real to him there as he passed the hours in meditation and prayer. His biographer says[1]:

> I have been with him there on a moonlight evening when the vast building was haunted with strange lights and shades and the ticking of the great clock sounded like some giant's footsteps in the deep silence. Then he had always abundant company. Once a daughter in later years met him returning from one of his customary meditations in the solitary darkness of the chapel at Auckland Castle, and she said to him, 'I expect you do not feel alone?' 'Oh, no,' he said, 'it is full'; and as he spoke his face shone with one of his beautiful smiles.

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 313.

The readers of this article may find their inspiration more readily in an old barn crowded with eager seekers after God and echoing with prayers in which sincerity has to supply the place of literary form; but we can none the less acknowledge with thankfulness that there are 'varieties of religious experience' different from those which most appeal to us. Where, as in Westcott's case, a religion which feeds on glorious buildings and hoary liturgies brings forth a perfect charity towards all men, and never stoops to declare that religion which finds its inspiration elsewhere is no religion at all, our appreciation of it can only be ungrudging. The food on which our bodies live is manifold in outward form and taste, but its vital elements reduce themselves to very few. And the food of the soul is one in all who truly live, and one alone.

But we need endeavour no longer to pursue the chemical analysis of the sap of a noble tree, and the deeply-hidden sources from which its penetrating roots derived its vital strength. The fruits are there for all to see. There is the solid work he did in binding together and instructing all who loved his Master, and revealing to them fresh fields in which the lessons of the divine-human life can be a power for the doing of good. There is the lifelong devotion to the cause of the kingdom—abroad, where three of his sons toil still, two of them in active life, the youngest in the memory 'that the Master accepted early the offering which he gladly made'[1]—and at home, where strenuous and self-denying toil brought the influences of Christianity into even the chill atmosphere of industrial warfare, and impressed upon the most unpromising souls the sense of the Master's claim. Two companion pictures are before me as I try to realise the lesson of the beautiful life, some of which I was privileged to see from near at hand. One is the long row of Westcott's books upon the shelves I have dedicated to works of New Testament Revisers—all of them, except their venerable chairman, enjoying perfect fellowship in the Homeland with Him whose Word they strove to make better known to men. The other is the simple but deeply moving scene in Auckland Chapel on the 2nd of August 1901, when they laid the great Bishop's body to rest in the place where, as I remembered, he stood once with my father, with rapt far-away looks, telling of his predecessors who were buried there, in clear anticipation of the day when he should be with them. In the representative gathering that thronged the little chapel, for what his son truly describes as a service of 'praise and thanksgiving for the faithful labours ended,' were men of all classes and men of all Churches. Three of us from the Wesleyan Conference, with members of the local Free Church Council, joined dignitaries of the Church of England in common thankfulness and common mourning for a great Christian and a great man taken from our head that day; and opposite where we stood there was a fisherman in his jersey, whose aspect moved to thought more than anything else in the scene. For the fisherman and the books combine to make complete the message Westcott leaves to the world, a message summed up for him in his own report of a last conversation with his old master, Bishop Prince Lee [1]:

---

[1] Vol. ii. p. 231.

> 'People quote various words of the Lord,' said the Bishop, 'as containing the sum of the Gospel—the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, and the like; to me the essence of the Gospel is in simpler and shorter terms: "Fear not, only believe!" Ah! Westcott, mark that *only*. "Fear not, only believe!"' And his eyes were filled with tears as he spoke. 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief,' was the only answer.

Only! how easy for some, how hard for others, how entirely a matter of indifference to many more! But Westcott's works and Westcott's work will make it easier for many who will lead their fellowmen into the Truth he loved on earth and now beholds in heaven.

---

[1] Vol. i. p. 249.

THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE AND THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT[1]

THE history of this Lectureship, in connection with which I have the honour of appearing before you to-night, illustrates the many-sidedness of Greek Testament study. In other English Universities it has been the close preserve of the clergy, and has been associated with the special type of learning which finds its chosen field in the ponderous tomes of early Christian literature. But the Greenwood Lectureship has had a very different history. Founded sixteen years ago, by the munificence of Mr. C. J. Heywood, it bears the name of a layman, one who is not likely to be forgotten so long as this University is faithful to the ideals of its great Principal. But it does not merely perpetuate the memory of Principal Greenwood. It is intended to keep up the study of a subject he loved to teach. I have heard old pupils of his speak with peculiar warmth of the Greek Testament class Dr. Greenwood used to take, one which had no definite relation to degree courses, but consisted of students of all kinds, drawn together by the enthusiasm of his teaching, and the love of the subject which they shared with the unprofessional teacher. No wonder the University chose another layman to take charge of the subject when Dr. Greenwood's voice was heard no more! I feel that my election quite rudely breaks the succession—though, indeed, I may plead that Dr. Wilkins's *Alma Mater* and my own would have regarded

---

[[1] The Inaugural Lecture delivered by Dr. Moulton on January 30, 1906, as Greenwood Lecturer in Greek Testament, in the University of Manchester.]

us as equally unclerical had we sought her permission to teach theology within her walls. My safest defence will be to prove that I am joined to my predecessor by a close tie which ensures continuity of aim. My personal friendship with Dr. Wilkins began a very long time ago, for he took charge of me when I first 'went up' to Cambridge. He was a brilliant undergraduate, and I was a youth of thirty-four (months). His tutorship at that time only lasted from King's Cross to Cambridge station, nor do I remember the classical lore with which he no doubt improved my mind; but the occasion was the beginning of a friendly relation which survived even the test of his examining me for a London degree. My removal from Cambridge to Manchester came just after his physical breakdown had cut short the activity to which this University owes an ineffaceable debt. But when Dr. Wilkins could no longer teach Latin, he still clung to his Greek Testament work, and continued, so far as shattered health allowed him, to take charge of the subject he loved best of all.

As a natural sequel to what I have been saying of my predecessor, I should like to keep my advertised subject waiting a minute or two longer while I explain how I propose to interpret the duties of this office. A portion of the Greek Testament is, happily, a subject for the Final B.A.; and the establishment of the Divinity degrees will no doubt make this option popular with many who contemplate theological studies when they have graduated in Arts. But I shall be very far from satisfied if my class in connection with this set subject includes only those who take up Greek Testament because of its importance for the profession to which they are dedicating their lives. The New Testament is the layman's book; and every man and woman to whom its teaching appeals may be earnestly invited to study it in its original form. The linguistic equipment necessary before such study can be profitable is easy of attainment; and the gains of the study, even in its elementary stages, are out of all proportion to the labour involved. I shall therefore hope to find the subject attracting men and women students who have no professional object in view ; and I should like to see many attending the class who are contemplating no degree examination at all. But this last category mostly comes under the second division of my proposals for the conduct of the Lectureship. There are, I believe, many of the general public who would like to take up this study for its own intrinsic interest and importance. They may have no opportunity or even wish to get up a New Testament book for examination. But they could follow an attempt to interpret such a book for its own sake, based upon the Greek text, but freed from technicalities, and in the main intelligible even to those who have nothing but the English before them. To gather together a weekly class of this kind is an ambition I very sincerely cherish, and I hope to begin it next October, if in the meantime I can find out under what conditions it can be made most generally useful.[1] Perhaps some of those present to-night may help me here by their suggestions on such points as the hour at which the class—presumably an evening class—might best meet. I can only say that I shall welcome any expressions of opinion which may assist me in my wish to popularise, as far as I can, the great subject of which this University has made me a custodian. The Greenwood Lecturer is no longer, I am thankful to say, the only or the chief representative of New Testament study in this place. If I can do anything to open the door of Professor Peake's classroom to some whose imperfect equipment might otherwise have kept them outside, I shall feel that I have sufficiently justified my appointment, and done both the students and the University a service for which they will thank me.

But it is time to turn from this preface to the subject which has been announced. I wish to describe tonight, as well as I can, the road by which both my predecessor and myself came to the study of the Greek Testament. The mere fact that it is not the beaten track may in itself be a definite advantage to those who travel upon it. Almost any subject of research may be furthered not a little by the advent of students who come to it from more or less distant fields. They will have to be fully alive to the dangers inseparable from their lack of training along the regular lines. But this disadvantage will often be more than compensated by the polarising of the light, the testing of conclusions, hitherto assumed as axiomatic, by the introduction of criteria drawn from experience in other branches of study. However this may be in general, there can be no question as to the truth of the principle when applied to theology. In a country like Germany, where specialism has gone much further than it has in England, the somewhat narrow training of the professional Biblical critic has sometimes led to extreme one-sidedness, which cried aloud for broader views, for healthy common sense, for knowledge of other fields of research, to correct its extravagances and to sift its results. It is very significant that some of the most effective stimulus that New Testament study has received for years past has come from men who have won their laurels in very different subjects. Professor Friedrich Blass has brought his unparalleled knowledge of the whole range of classical Greek, his refined taste and critical acumen, to illuminate the great literature which many classical scholars have despised because in the interval of four centuries the Greek language dared to grow. Professor W. M. Ramsay has contributed an astonishing amount of new light from the investigations of an archæologist who knows Asia Minor as it never has been known. And now the veteran Julius Wellhausen has turned from the Old Testament researches which will always be associated with his name, to help in the fascinating task of reconstructing the original Aramaic records on which our Gospels are built. And so with many another honoured name. Historians, philosophers, experts in physical science, students of ancient law, pioneers in the infant sciences of anthropology and comparative religion—there is plenty of room for all of them in the inexhaustible task on which every generation starts afresh, of interpreting for the times the Book that has re-created the world.

---

[1] The subject will be 'The Words of Jesus,' as recorded in the common elements of the First and Third Gospels.

If this is so, there may be room for contributions from students of the Science of Language. For some reason or other, we as a tribe have had to put up with an extraordinary amount of contumely from devotees of sciences which pride themselves on superiority. The withering scorn with which Jülicher speaks of 'the philologist Blass' will serve as a good example. 'Mere grammar' figures in every popular denunciation of the system of instruction pursued in our Public Schools; and it is abundantly clear that if boys could only be diverted from the soul-destroying work of learning declensions and conditional sentences, and properly taught how to make sulphuretted hydrogen, the educational millennium would soon be here. And yet these evangelists of nobler studies are only enabled to preach by the use of language; and the words and constructions they use have, if only they knew it, a history as fascinating as that of any microbe, and capable of treatment as rigidly scientific. It would be easy to spend most of my time to-night upon a plea for the Science of Language in general, but I must resist temptation. My immediate duty is to show how we may bring linguistic study to bear upon the elucidation of the New Testament. The subject is a wide one, and I can only briefly indicate some of its heads to-night, postponing to more frequently recurring occasions the practical application of the principles I endeavour to lay down.

The Science of Language has two main divisions, according as it deals with isolated words or with words in a sentence. The former embraces Etymology and Accidence, the latter Syntax. In the first division, we may dismiss Accidence with a few words. It is a subject which painfully interests the beginner, who can do but little to the interpretation of the text he is studying until he is able to parse the verbs with approximate accuracy. The history of the forms themselves, as traced by the comparative method through ancient and recondite languages to the prehistoric speech of our ultimate common ancestors, is an extraordinarily interesting pursuit, but hardly one after which the tiro in Hellenistic Greek will turn aside. But the study of Etymology, to judge from the pages of the commentators and the columns of Grimm-Thayer's *New Testament Lexicon*, must have no small importance for the accurate delineation of the words the meaning of which we seek. Perhaps scientific linguistic here will act mainly in a negative direction. Generations of examiners have displayed insatiable curiosity as to the etymology of the Hellenistic word for *sheep*. But even when the expected (and probably mythical) answer is given, that it means 'the creature that goes forward,' I do not know that we have discovered much which clarifies our hazy ideas respecting an animal that only etymology regards as progressive. How familiar we are with the supposed fact that *sincere* means 'without wax'! But if I cast doubt on a hoary superstition to-night, the agnostic condition into which I bring you will not lessen the clearness of your understanding as to the meaning and the virtue of 'sincerity.' Scientific linguistic may have to show that very many dictionary etymologies are little more than irresponsible guesswork; but, after all, this does not affect the really important questions we have to ask, as to the meaning of words during the historical period of Greek, and the principles which must guide us in delimiting their development-history. Even research into the prehistoric meaning of words may sometimes help us to fix their meaning in Christian

Greek, if it be carried on with judgment; but it is not often that it yields results worthy of the trouble taken. On this side our work will mostly be to clear away the useless statements out of obsolete text-books that still deface the works on which our students depend for the interpretation of New Testament words. Linguistic science can, however, do something with words which have come into being within the separate life-history of Greek. It can examine the principles of word-formation, and the development and uses of suffixes. Thus there is the most important term *Paraclete* as used by St. John. The old translation, 'Comforter,' was based on ignorance of the fact that the form must be passive when derived from a transitive verb: if therefore the meaning 'comfort' be selected among the senses attached to the verb, we must understand *Paraclete* to mean 'one who is comforted.' Many illustrations might be given to show how necessary it is that lexical investigations, which have so constantly to be responsible for determining the meaning of a passage in the New Testament, should be controlled by adequate knowledge of linguistic science, and particularly of the department of Semantics, the as yet rather neglected study of the principles governing the changes of meaning in words.

In this study of words and their meanings I may remind you how rich a vein has been opened within the last ten years by the discovery of innumerable documents proved to be written in the very idiom of the Greek Bible. I was attempting a year ago in this place to depict the revolution in New Testament lexicography due to Deissmann's discovery that the non-literary Egyptian papyri coincide closely in the form of their Greek with the language of Paul and Luke and John, hitherto supposed to be a Greek wholly without parallel outside the area of Jewish writers. I do not intend to go over this ground again to-night, but will make this my transition to the larger subject which comes next. The discovery of Deissmann was mainly worked out by him in the field of lexical research. He took Greek Biblical words, found parallels for them in the papyri, and showed how the meanings previously assumed to be peculiar, due to literal translation from Hebrew or Aramaic originals, were in reality current in the ordinary daily speech of people who had never heard a word of Semitic in their lives. What Deissmann proved from vocabulary, has now been established beyond controversy in the larger sphere of grammar, and gives us our most conspicuous illustration of the service which the Science of Language can render to New Testament study.

Let me pause here, then, to explain the nature of a revolution—for it is no less—which has taken place in our views of New Testament Greek within the past ten years. The history of interpretation shows many succeeding phases of theory, but one doctrine at least was regarded as established beyond controversy, the isolated character of Biblical Greek. Gallant efforts were made by the 'Purist' school to show that the New Testament was really written in Greek which could be supported from one period or another of the vast literature of Hellenism. But even the absurd excesses of their opponents, the 'Hebraist' school, failed to discount their utter failure. Real parallels to the idiom of the sacred writers could not be found, not even in Jewish authors like Philo or Josephus, nor in the Greek Fathers of the post-apostolic ages. It was natural that a theory should be framed to account for these strange facts. It began with the Septuagint, that marvellous pioneer translation of the Old Testament by which nameless Jewish scholars of Egypt tried to make their Scriptures intelligible to the world of Hellenism, as well as to their countrymen who could not understand the already obsolescent Hebrew. The translators themselves frequently failed to interpret the Hebrew rightly; and, as modern examinees often do under similar circumstances, they took refuge in a barbarous literalness which caused the translation to be as unintelligible as the original. In many more places they pursued the same policy through sheer reverence for the text: like the successive translators of our English Bible, they shrank from eliminating words and phrases, characteristic of the Hebrew, but entirely functionless in the language of the translation. Take, for example, the perpetually recurring 'It came to pass' in our Bibles. Hebrew has an idiomatic formula used in narrative, by which the finite verb is preceded by what is literally 'And it was, and . . .' Thus if Luke ii. 1 were put into Hebrew it would run, 'And it was in those days and there went forth a decree.' Obviously the English of this is, 'Now about that time a decree was promulgated'; and idiomatic Greek would equally require a sentence on those lines. But the Septuagint translators would not sacrifice the characteristic idiom of the Hebrew, and they forced it into a Greek that was about on the same footing as our own, 'It came to pass that . . .' This translation-Greek became familiar in a few generations to those who used exclusively the Greek Bible; and New Testament writers followed it much as English writers of devotional literature follow the phraseology of the Authorised Version, even where it differs entirely from the English current to-day. Then there was another force at work. The Apostles and Evangelists were assumed to be men who thought in Aramaic, the ordinary language of Palestine; and their Greek was accordingly the result of a translation process, even where they were not definitely rendering words that had been spoken in their native tongue. Hence arose a peculiar form of Jewish Greek, naturally unparalleled outside the circle of Biblical writers. It was a 'language of the Holy Ghost,' as a pious German scholar put it, never profaned by common use, and as alien from the ordinary language of life as the religious dialect of English which is based upon our Bible.

Now it has been the work of the Science of Language during the past ten years to remove this theory of

Biblical Greek almost entirely from its established position. The researches of Deissmann showed the vocabulary of the Greek Bible to be simply that of everyday life, differing in no important respect from the language of men of equal education in Egypt, Asia Minor, or Greece. The hint thus given has already been exceedingly fertile in results. The most recent commentators are writing with a tableful of papyrus collections at their side, and the word-indices are being well thumbed. But this is not all. Searching the papyri for their vocabulary soon shows that their grammar likewise is that of the New Testament writers when we bring into comparison writers of approximately equal culture. In other words, the 'Biblical Greek' is isolated no more. The 'language of the Holy Ghost' is simply the language of daily life all over the Greek-speaking world, which was nearly conterminous with the Roman Empire. That the Holy Ghost spoke in the language in which the largest possible number of people could understand Him is a conclusion obviously in accord with the whole method of Revelation as we can see it. Nor can we fail to realise the immense significance of the fact that Christianity came to the civilised world just at the time when unity of government and unity of language had been established from one end of it to the other. For Greek was the world-language of the time, with a dominion as widely established as that of English to-day, and as marked an internal unity of structure. Along Roman roads, under the protection of Roman law, the first missionaries of Christ carried their Gospel to people of every race, all of them capable of understanding sufficiently well the Greek in which the message was given. By the time that the Empire became hostile, and still more when Babel had invaded the unity of its common speech, the power of the Gospel was too firmly established to need such aids to its progress. The sciences of history and language unite to show how wonderfully timed was the appearance of

Him who brought to mankind the revelation of a Father in heaven.

Without trenching further on the ground covered in the lecture of a year ago,[1] to which this is a kind of sequel, I want to show the nature of the new tools with which the labours of the grammarians have enriched the New Testament student. What I have just been describing goes to show that we must expect to find our lights upon Biblical Greek, not as hitherto mainly in the narrow circle of Jewish language and ideas, but in the immense field of Greek as spoken and written throughout the Gentile world. I do not, of course, mean to say that Semitic influences are not to be found in the Greek of the New Testament. But we are able to delimit them much more closely, and hold the balance more evenly between the Greek and the Semitic. A considerable part of the New Testament is based upon translations from the Aramaic. St. Mark's Gospel, which forms one of the two main sources of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's, tells in rough, unpolished Greek a story which the writer had heard and told so often in Aramaic that he was virtually translating in a large proportion of his narrative. Most of you probably heard Dr. Sanday's extremely suggestive account, in his lecture of last Tuesday, of the conditions under which the writers of our First and Third Gospels may be supposed to have worked. He showed how either they themselves, or an educated scribe whom they followed, smoothed away the literal and unidiomatic turns of expression by which St. Mark had represented the Aramaic of St. Peter's original words. Wellhausen's recent study of the subject prompts us to believe that in the famous manuscript of the Gospels and Acts, Codex Bezae, which is the special treasure of our Cambridge University Library, we have a form of St. Mark which lies even nearer to the Aramaic: it might even turn out that the hypothetical copy from which Dr. Sanday derives our ordinary text of the Gospel had been itself to some extent revised by some one whose Greek was a little more idiomatic than the Evangelist's own. But this by the way. Aramaic, of course, underlies other parts of the New Testament as well. Though it is almost certain that our Lord and His Apostles understood and used Greek, there can be no doubt that the 'Words of Jesus,' which formed the other great source of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, were originally spoken in Aramaic, just as Papias tells us they were first written down. The native dialect of Palestine accordingly supplies a very large part of the New Testament, translated into Greek which we now know is hardly ever really foreign to Greek colloquial style, but which often would betray itself as a translation. The literalisms of our English Bible illustrate this phenomenon very well. We very rarely use the interjection 'Behold' in ordinary speech, and normal late Greek speech did not use it much more than we do. In those parts of the New Testament which come from Aramaic sources, or are written by men (like St. James) who continued to use Aramaic as their ordinary language, we find this 'behold' extremely often. There is a curious parallel in Shakespeare, who makes his Welsh Captain Fluellen perpetually use the phrase 'look you'—correct English, and not uncommon still in the Dales—simply because it translated Welsh interjections which adorned his speech abundantly when he was at home. We find a very few places in which something entirely un-Greek has been admitted by bald literal translation, like 'saved Noah the eighth person' in the Authorised Version of 2 Peter ii. 5. The other kind of Semitism, due to the copying of phraseology which had passed into religious style from the over-literal Septuagint version of the Old Testament, was especially prominent in the writings of the Gentile Luke, as Dr. Sanday reminded us last week. But St. Luke very markedly drops this style when his narrative passes away from

---

[1] See *Theological Lectures* (Manchester University Press, 1905), pp. 161-175.

Palestine into the Gentile world, where he felt it was less appropriate. Here, and in the Epistles generally, except where there is definite quotation from the Old Testament or an Aramaic saying of Jesus we are able now to assert that the language is absolutely normal Greek as spoken throughout the Roman world. Papyri and inscriptions, preserving the language of conversation, instead of the largely artificial language of books, which were till lately our only source for the knowledge of later Greek, have shown us that the ingenuity of the 'Hebraist' school was almost all wasted, that grammatical usages formerly assumed to be barbarous, lifted straight out of Hebrew and Aramaic, were part and parcel of the daily language of men whose native dialect was as far from the speech of Canaan as from that of Timbuctoo.

It is not quite easy to give illustrations of this momentous change in our definitions, one which you can easily see must very often alter seriously our conception of the meaning of the Greek Testament; but perhaps I may find one or two which can be made clear without straying into technicalities. The use of the preposition *in* is a very good example. This exactly translates the Hebrew and Aramaic *bĕ* in a large proportion of its usages, but the latter is used also to express the instrumental *with*, for which the Greek preposition was no more appropriate than our *in* would be. No wonder therefore that when St. Paul wrote, 'Shall I come to you *in* a rod?' grammarians assumed he was merely mistranslating Hebrew. But it happened that in a volume of papyri which Drs. Grenfell and Hunt published three years ago, there were half a dozen examples of the phrase '*in* swords,' '*in* sticks,' where literary Greek of all ages would have expressed the instrumental sense by a dative without preposition. We are able to understand the use of *in* now from study of the late Greek vernacular. It was always a very common preposition, as we should expect. A diligent German grammarian, Dr. Helbing, tells us that it occurs 6031 times in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, and 17,130 times in twelve voluminous historians of the post-classical age. These figures are not much more than half of those which the same patient enumerator assigns to *into* in the twelve post-classical writers. But in the New Testament the case is very much altered, for *into* occurs only 1743 times, but *in* 2698. (I hasten to disclaim any credit for rivalling Dr. Helbing in industry, for happily a concordance gives the New Testament enumerator a most unfair advantage!) This great increase of the use of *in* is abundantly paralleled in the papyri. *In* goes with the dative in Greek, and in the vernacular language we find the dative falling more and more out of use as the centuries went on: it is obsolete in the genuine vernacular of to-day. But in the first century A.D. we find the dative very much alive. It was used so freely that it ultimately ceased to be useful, and died as we might say of fatty degeneration. A case that could mean almost anything could not be trusted out alone; and we cannot be surprised that nursemaid *in* and nursemaid *with* frequently shirked their proper work and meddled with each other's province in attending to their troublesome charge. I may quote two papyri of the second century B.C., which in saying 'weakened with hunger' use respectively the simple dative and the dative with *in*, though the phrase is otherwise identical. I have said enough to show that the use of *in* to express the meaning of *with* has nothing to do with Hebrew. A very short study of the New Testament in the original will suffice to show how important to the exposition is a correct account of this little word, so that the new light here is something to be thankful for.

The example I have been giving will serve to illustrate Hebraisms that disappear under the new treatment, in this case with one or two exceptions in which we must still recognise the influence of an all too faithful translator. On the other side I ought to give an example of the kind of Semitism which (within limits) we have to retain in places where direct translation has taken place. There are a good many languages which either never possessed or have lost the reflexive pronoun, and are consequently obliged to fill the gap with a noun. To express the metaphysical conception of the *self* or *Ego*, primitive minds have to apply material conceptions as well as they can; and the *breath* is naturally the favourite one, among savages to-day as among the great nations of history in their earliest development of thought. Thus what we express by *self*—a word of doubtful original meaning—Sanskrit expressed by *âtman*, and Hebrew by *nephesh*, both of which meant 'breath.' In both these utterly unrelated languages this word could express on the one side the mere reflexive, and on the other the idea of the soul, life, or self. It was this word which Jesus must have used when He said: 'What doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his *life*' or '*soul*'? This involves translating the Aramaic by the Greek word from which we derive our *psychical*, itself originally meaning 'breath' like the others, but in the language of Greek thought long developed into a much more recondite idea. Now notice that when St. Luke takes over this saying he substitutes 'lose or forfeit his own *self*,' using the ordinary reflexive. You can see at once that it makes all the difference here whether we regard this phrase as native Greek, or interpret it as St. Luke (or rather, probably, his immediate source) did, by going back to the meaning of the Aramaic in which the saying was given. 'To lose one's *soul*' is a phrase which careless modern readers pass by as a sort of theological conception they are content to ignore. 'To lose one's *self*,' though it really means the same thing, has a comprehensiveness and a freedom from religious technicality about it which is much more calculated to appeal to the modern mind.

Having thus sketched the newer view of Biblical Greek, in its relation to the Greek of the outside world, I pass on to define more exactly the materials with which the grammarian is now able to contribute his share to the understanding of the apostles and evangelists. Of the papyri I have already said almost enough. I need only add a few words as to the wide differences of culture that are found in the documents. We open a papyrus and we may find a well-written, correctly spelt private letter from a highly educated man. It is not expressed in the artificial literary style in which the writer would compose a treatise or a poem. The difference is familiar enough to us. We may find a good illustration in the pages of Macaulay's *Life*, in which extracts are given from the historian's diary, noting for his own use what he saw in Londonderry. There the biographer adds the corresponding passages as worked up in the *History*. But our papyrus may just as well be a problem of writing, spelling, and grammar, which only the expert can interpret, and that only by the aid of a lively imagination and wide knowledge of the life of the farmers, the temple recluses, the schoolboys of the lower standards, in the half-Hellenised Egypt of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. Between these extremes we have intermediates of every grade. The study of these varied documents—perhaps most of all that of the most illiterate—throws a flood of light on the direction of development in the vernacular of the Greek world. Now when we turn to the New Testament, we find varieties of culture, not as wide indeed as these, but sufficiently marked to make it imperative on us to take each author by himself, assigning him his place on the 'grammatometer' which we may construct by the aid of the papyri. At the top stands the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—authoress, I should prefer to say, following with Professor Peake, Harnack's ascription of the letter to Priscilla. It is spoken Greek, answering fairly well to the English which we should hear in the pulpit from a great extempore preacher: the archaisms of Greek written style are avoided as much as the lighter colloquialisms of daily life. On about the same level stands St. Luke, with the Hellenist's instinct of style, the only New Testament writer to use the archaic 'potential optative,' by his time only found in books—and yet in following his sources ready to incorporate their characteristic roughnesses, and even to add on his own account Greek which a Gentile would not have used, copying the style of the Greek Bible. Then there is St. Paul, dictating his letters to the breathless amanuensis, with never a thought of style or literary ornament, but pouring forth a rapid stream of conversational Greek as spoken by a highly cultured man who has used the language all his life. At the other end of the scale we see St. Mark, and the author of the Revelation. The latter, like many of the writers of papyri, has very imperfect ideas of the use of cases and genders. He will put nominatives to stand in apposition to genitives or other cases, on much the same principle as an imperfectly cultured Englishman—following Shakespeare, by the way—will say 'between you and I.' How our 'grammatometer' may be used in what is called 'Higher Criticism,' may be seen when we reflect that the author of Revelation, if he is also the author of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John, must either have improved his Greek in the meantime by several years' residence in a Greek city where he could no longer use Aramaic in daily conversation, or in composing the Gospel must have left the actual expression of his thought to better Hellenists than himself. To decide between these, and the third alternative of separate authorship, the literary critic must call in the grammarian to take his humble share.

Next to the papyri we take the inscriptions, a familiar field for two or three generations now to the student of the classical language, but only recently taken up systematically as an aid to the work of New Testament exegesis. The pioneer work of our own Canon Hicks in this field will not be overlooked here. Inscriptions have a disadvantage in comparison with papyri, in that they do not generally belong so completely to the language of daily life. But they come, in perpetually increasing numbers, from every part of the Greek world, and give us invaluable help in showing the essential homogeneousness of the world-language as spoken in widely distant countries. The possession of the papyri and the inscriptions enables us now to use with new understanding the immense mass of Greek literature. We have the permanent features of the language traced in the classical period, in the later literature, and in the vernacular; and the value of the post-classical writers is immensely enhanced for us by the fact that new criteria enable us to distinguish between purely literary archaisms and genuine elements of popular speech which the literary man has not succeeded in pruning away. The new-born scientific interest in the later history of the Greek language has prompted systematic research even in the literature of the Byzantine age, into which a classical scholar of fifty years ago could hardly dip without risking his reputation. And —more astonishing condescension still!—first-class philologists like Thumb and Krumbacher and Kretschmer in Germany, and Hatzidakis in Athens, are registering the grammar of the vernacular Greek of to-day, and its dialectic variations as spoken by uncultured artisans and rustics in different parts of Greece and Asia Minor. The importance of Modern Greek for the study of the New Testament received practical recognition, almost for the first time, at any rate in England, in my father's edition of G. B. Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, which appeared thirty-six years ago. Since then our materials have greatly increased, and with them has increased our knowledge of their importance. Eliminating the artificial Greek of books and newspapers, and putting aside elements in the popular speech derived from Turkish or other alien sources, we find in the Greek of to-day a lineal descendant of the vernacular of the first century of our era; and the folksongs of modern Hellas, or the Gospels as translated into the vulgar tongue by Pallis, form an aid to Greek Testament study which no grammarian can afford to ignore.

It is now time that I should give a few illustrations of the practical working out of these new methods. Most of the examples which present themselves are too technical for exposition here; but there are a good many which are clear in themselves and can be appreciated without my attempting to expatiate on arcana of grammatical lore. I was speaking just now of the help which grammar may give to higher criticism, and may begin with one or two points by way of supplement under this heading. The question of the unity of books in the New Testament is one in which the grammarian must have his say, as well as the critic of style. A decisive answer as to the problem of the Third Gospel and the Acts, as to whether these books are from the same hand, and that the hand of the diarist whose 'We-document' in the latter half of Acts forms one of the pivots of New Testament criticism, could probably be given best by an exhaustive comparison of a number of syntactical usages as seen in these various sections of the writings attributed to the companion of St. Paul. If I may judge from the incidental examples which have come my way, the verdict will be unmistakably on the side of the tradition. A criterion which may possibly prove of importance, in determining the geographical *provenance* of New Testament writers, is supplied in a recent suggestion by Professor Thumb, of Marburg. He points out that the infinitive of Ancient Greek still survives in the Modern Greek of Asia Minor, while, as is well known, it has entirely vanished from that of Greece itself. Now in the ancient vernacular we find some writers showing a strong tendency towards the use of the clause with *that* which ultimately supplanted the infinitive in European Greek, while others retain the infinitive by preference. If we can show that this and other dialectic variations within Modern Greek were already in existence nineteen centuries ago, and if we can delimit their geographical distribution for that time, we shall evidently possess a useful test by which to decide (for example) whether St. Luke came from Philippi or Antioch, or whether the Fourth Gospel was written by one who formed his Greek in Ephesus.

And now for one or two points of undiluted grammar. An interesting and sometimes very important feature of Hellenistic, as compared with classical Greek, is the rapid decline of grammatical resources for distinguishing between duality and plurality. In Homer and in the great Attic writers we find a separate Dual Number still surviving in nouns, pronouns, and verbs. It answers to that which may be seen in Sanskrit and Old Persian, and in the Gothic of the fourth century A.D., in which Wulfila made the Bible speak for the first time to a people of our own Teutonic stock. I am personally inclined to conjecture that the Dual arose in a pre-historic age when our ancestors—like a good many savages of the present day—could not count beyond two. But long before the Indo-Germans had divided into Aryans proper, Kelts, Italians, Germans, Greeks, Slavs, and the rest, they had developed a much more advanced arithmetic ; and they used up the old Dual for the special purpose of describing things that go in pairs. This was evidently a mere luxury of language, and we cannot wonder that the Greek dialects of Asia Minor, like Latin, and modern languages generally, let it drop as a superfluity. In the Common Greek, the genesis of which I briefly described in my lecture of a year ago, the Dual and all its works had utterly vanished. But this was not all. Like English, Greek had whole categories of words the differentia of which depended on the distinction between duality and plurality. There were words answering to our own adjectives *whether*, *either*, and *other*, and several more which, like these, contemplated the antithesis of two individuals or two classes. There were also the great categories of comparative and superlative; for, of course, the word *greater* implies comparison with one other individual, or with all other individuals regarded as a whole, while *greatest* implies at least three items among which comparison is made. Now when we study the papyri, we find that dual words of all these classes have lost their special distinction. They have either become obsolete, wholly or partially, or are used indiscriminately for dual and plural alike. The superlative has practically vanished, except in what is called the *elative* sense, to express '*very* great,' etc. In the case of *former* and *first* it is the comparative which has all but disappeared, so that St. John (i. 15 and xv. 18) says *first* where he means *before*. All this was unsuspected twenty-five years ago; and the Revisers then scrupulously inserted margins, such as 'Gr. *first in regard of me*,' for the text 'before me,' and 'Gr. *greater*' where English idiom had forced them to say 'the greatest in the kingdom of heaven,' 'the greatest of these is love.' We can now dispense with such notes and accept the text as a truly literal rendering. In the first words of the Acts, the author reminds Theophilus of his 'former treatise'; but since the Greek has '*first*,' Professor Ramsay argued that St. Luke must have meant to write a third. Whether that be so or not, it is clear we cannot use this argument to prove it. There is actually one place in Acts where even the word *both* can hardly be understood except by the assumption that it means *all*. I doubt whether here (xix. 16) we have what St. Luke wrote; but it is noteworthy that in other places this highly educated writer defies the classical distinction. In Luke vi. 29 he keeps without demur the word for 'the *other* cheek' which to Demosthenes or Plato would have suggested our possession of at least three cheeks apiece; and in the Parable of the Sower he uses the dual word for *other*, of *four* alternatives, where his source, St. Mark, had been classically correct. This important change in the language is interesting to us, because it is so closely paralleled in present-day English. The Revisers were bound by their rules to keep the utterly obsolete phrase 'Whether of the twain,' in Matthew xxvii. 21. But it is significant that the original answers to 'Which of the two': the Greek which in both words corresponds to our archaism would not be found in spoken language much after the fourth century B.C. In the matter of comparison, we all know we ought to say 'the better of the two,' but 'the best of them all.' Are you all prepared to lay hand on heart and declare that you never said and never will say 'the best of the two'? If conscience smites you at my inquiry, I can reassure you from personal observation among cultured people: you sin in excellent company, and I am not afraid to prophesy that posterity will be on your side. I myself, a professional grammarian, spoke of 'four alternatives' just now! Well, I would say it again without a blush; for I feel quite certain that when in some distant epoch a new Dr. Grenfell digs up this lecture, he will point out to an admiring world that the dark ages of the twentieth century produced at any rate one mind that could penetrate futurity, and speak in the tongues of men as yet unborn!

Pursuing a little further this desultory selection of grammatical points which may be illustrated without becoming abstruse, I may pause a moment on another phenomenon of Number, the relations of *we* and *I* in the letters of St. Paul. Among the various suspect traits which the late Professor van Manen discovered in the letter to Philemon was 'a surprising mixture of singular and plural in the persons speaking. . . .' Nobody takes poor van Manen seriously now; and scholars with a reputation to lose would be very hard up for a subject if they undertook to impugn the genuineness of Philemon. But the sentence just quoted from the Dutch 'hypercritic' will serve to introduce the remark that papyrus letters dispel any 'surprise' we might have felt in St. Paul's mixture of *we* and *I*. Without the excuse of the journalist, who has to multiply himself to make his readers appreciate the mighty consensus that his single opinion represents, or the author, who is too modest to let his printer invest in a new fount of capital *I's*, the humble epistolographers allowed *we* and *I* to chase each other over their pages without rhyme or reason. Such a sentence as 'Having heard (*singular*) that you are out of sorts, we are distressed,' will serve as a short sample. It seems safe to say that future critics will not spend much ingenuity on the task of finding associates to justify the frequent *we* of St. Paul. There are one or two other matters I might mention from the grammarian's chapter on pronouns, but I must be content with merely instancing some typical points from the verb. Take the painful statistics by which laborious grammarians have shown the difference between the moods which may express the desire of a speaker that those he addresses should do what he describes. We have here all the gradations between a blunt authoritative command and the most cringing entreaty. Statistical research among the Attic Orators has shown that a speaker desirous of conciliating the sovereign people made chary use of the imperative, and shunned it entirely in his exordium. The Sophist Protagoras even blamed the divine bard himself for beginning the *Iliad* with an imperative, '*Sing*, heavenly Muse.' The petitions which fill so large a part of the papyrus collections are even more careful to let no rude imperative jar on the ear of king or governor, from whom their writers hope to gain redress for wrongs done. There is therefore all the more emphasis visible in the royal imperatives of Him who 'spake with authority,' and of His ambassadors who gave their commands on faith and morals in His name. The imperative mood has an interesting consequence attached to it when turned into a prohibition by prefixing the negative. There are two main forms of prohibition in Greek. One, with the present imperative, has been shown to mean generally 'Stop doing,' 'Don't do what you are doing now'; while the other is a warning against doing it in future time. It is rather startling therefore to hear St. Paul use the first of these forms when he bids his converts 'Lie not,' 'Be not drunken with wine,' or St. James when, 'before all things,' he exhorts Christians to 'Swear not at all.' We seem to gather that the first generation of Christianised heathens were subject to all the ethical perils which missionaries deplore among their eagerly gathered converts from heathenism to-day.

I pass before I close to the mention of another department in which the Science of Language has help to offer the student of the New Testament. Hitherto I have been referring only to grammatical researches within the limits of the Greek language, which can be and have been carried out by scholars knowing little of languages outside. But in undertaking to speak to-night of the Science of Language, I did not intend to confine the term to researches that concerned one language alone, even though that language were Greek, the queenliest tongue ever spoken on this earth. Greek is but one branch of a great family of speech, to which our own English belongs; and it is not reasonable to suppose that Greek can be perfectly understood without taking into account the seven other main branches that radiate from the same original. The best scholars working upon the two other sacred languages of the Christian Scriptures are exceedingly active to-day in the study of the cognate tongues. Professor Hogg's Assyrian class within these walls—on the successful establishment of which we justly pride ourselves not a little—is not attended only by those who want to read mercantile, religious, or mythological clay tablets from Nineveh or Babylon: the light which Assyrian can throw upon the cognate Hebrew and Aramaic probably bulks at least as large in the student's mind. The history of Greek scholarship in this country shows, unfortunately, no such readiness to admit the sidelights which can be drawn from the investigation of other Indo-Germanic tongues. Comparative Philology has rarely been asked for an opinion by exegetes and theologians; and the exceptions are usually in the relatively infertile field of etymology, where the guesses of German philologists belonging to the last school but two are still complacently quoted as final. Even among classical Greek scholars, few seem as yet aware that the last quarter of a century has witnessed a revolution which has made the Science of Language as much an exact science as chemistry, except for the element which has to be referred to psychology. The history of Greek on its structural and syntactical side can now be understood as never before by the unveiling of the pre-historic processes which made it what it was. In Winer's famous *Grammar*, already referred to, which finally left its author's hands just fifty years ago, the account of the Genitive begins with the statement that the case was 'unquestionably the *whence-case*, the case of *proceeding from* or *out of*.' Even at that date it may seem strange that 'John's coachman' should have been compelled by the exigencies of grammar to 'proceed from or out of' his employer. But the most elementary knowledge of comparative philology tells us that the Greek genitive is a 'syncretic' case, formed by the coalescence of the real 'whence-case,' the ablative, and the genitive proper, identical with our possessive. The period of arbitrary empiricism in grammar, in which usages are tortured into irrational agreement with a baseless first principle, is ended at once by the application of the comparative method. Greek cases have been made intelligible by the labours of syntactical experts like Delbrück, who interpret an abnormal-seeming usage by parallels drawn from Gothic or Zend, from Old Irish glosses or from the folk-songs of Lithuanian peasants now dwelling by the Baltic shores. And it is clear that everything which shows us how to get hold of the development-history of a case must touch at many points the interpretation of the New Testament itself. One more example must suffice to show how important are the contributions which this comparative study of allied languages may offer to the theologian, or the plain man who tries to follow the words of Scripture in their original form. Within the last few years philologists have been busy examining the ‘ kind of action ’ belonging to the tenses and the conjugation stems of verbs, and the effect produced upon it by compounding the verb with a preposition. In the latter part of the subject we need go no further than English to get information which will make the rationale of Greek compound verbs far clearer. (In this case Slavonic is more valuable still.) We have evidently travelled far from the days when Greek and Latin were the only languages worthy of study, and when the comparison of these very widely and deeply differing tongues was the only relief there was to the examination of each within its own limits exclusively. The results of all this work—mostly, as usual, done in Germany—have not yet come into our grammars. but they throw an immense amount of light upon the complexities of the Tenses. How important this is for the right understanding of hundreds of practical texts in Gospels or Epistles, a very short study will suffice to show.

I need hardly add, in bringing my plea to a close, that this sketch of what grammar and philology may contribute to the understanding of Scripture is not intended to exalt one method at the expense of another, to turn any one away from the more often trodden paths by which the end may be attained. No one man can treat so vast a subject with the expert’s thoroughness from all sides ; and the very existence of a Faculty of Theology, a partnership of workers whose strength lies in very different spheres, is witness to the many-sidedness of the subject which has been so lately added to the studies of this University. I may be told that I represent the humblest side of theology, the mere mechanical interpretation of words and sentences whose profound thoughts must be correlated and expounded by greater sciences than 'mere grammar.' Be it so: I am not careful to answer in this thing. If grammar be humble, it is at any rate indispensable; and in this capacity I may claim to hold the key of the gate past which the critic, the historian, the theologian, the philosopher cannot advance till grammar has withdrawn her veto. There may be many who have hitherto shrunk from essaying to enter the path I have been describing. They think that with the English Revised Version to help them, and good commentaries to consult, they can learn as much as they need for practical purposes of the wonderful literature on which so much of our country's moral and intellectual greatness is based. And, of course, this is entirely true. But yet there are very many things which no translation can supply and no commentary make live before us as the study of the original can make them. I asserted at the outset that the labour of learning enough Hellenistic Greek to profit from Greek Testament study is small relatively to the greatness of the gain. May I prove it by a fact from experience? Five or six years since, going to preach in a growing Midland town, I was taken to see an almost helpless cripple, living in a little cottage on parish relief—he could only move one hand and could do nothing to maintain himself. I found that some one had given him a little grammar of New Testament Greek, by the aid of which he had worked through several chapters of St. John. And every week there came to that humble cottage fresh recruits to a band of young men who received there lessons from the Book of books, interpreted by a better commentary than money can buy, and took thence an inspiration which made their church a power among the people around. The illustration with which I have commended the study of Greek carries with it the reminder of the intangible requisite without which even such reading is barren. But I am sure that if by the mere provision of the necessary instruments for the work I can open up to fresh students the way into these artless pages which have changed the face of the world, I may leave it to them to find that grammar may become the minister of gifts which examinations cannot measure nor degrees certify. With that hope I would take up the work which has come to me from men whose memory will always be cherished here, earnestly trusting that the deficiencies of the worker will be made up to the students by the unique greatness of the subject on which we are to spend our labour.[1]

---

[1] For nearly all the matters sketched in the above lecture, reference may be made to the writer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. i. (Prolegomena), just published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark.

THE PRIMITIVE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND ACTS[1]

Professor Clark's incursion into the most complex of all fields of textual criticism might be expected to bring advantages such as have often accrued to Biblical science by the wholesome neglect of the rule that keeps the shoemaker to his last. An expert trained for this new work by long familiarity with the ways of Ciceronian copyists, he can obviously enlighten us as to the weakness of scribes whose fellows may have dealt in like manner with the Gospels. He tells us that the careless omission of whole lines, one or many at a time, is the badge of all their tribe; and he is led accordingly to hold that the canon *brevior lectio potior* is to be reversed, and the fullest text is in general to be taken as primitive. In this of course Professor Clark has had predecessors. Mr. Cronin applied the principle to the omissions of the Sinaiticus in the Fourth Gospel (*Journ. Theol. Stud.* xiii. 563 ff., 1912); and Dr. Rendel Harris included it among the various processes discussed in an elaborate paper in *Amer. Journ. Philol.* iii. (1882) Appendix. But its uses in this book go far beyond anything previously attempted. Thus it is held to support the existence of Mark xvi. 9-20 and John vii. 53-viii. 11, in 'an archetype of the Gospels in book-form, which cannot be later than the middle of the second century.' Lest some Rip van Winkle should too hastily arise at the sound of such doctrine, and offer this little volume on Dean Burgon's tomb, as a tardy fulfilment of his famous prediction, we must be careful to observe Professor Clark's limitations. He is not concerned with 'the ultimate problems of New Testament autographs,' and starts with the text current in the second century. The Synoptic Problem and Higher Criticism generally he promises to avoid, and he keeps his promise. The careful reader of this book must therefore begin by asking whether in a very complex and many-sided problem a single method can be expected to secure really trustworthy results. And if Professor Clark's thesis were conceded, must we necessarily assume that the reconstructed text of A.D. 150 represents better than its rivals the autographs published between fifty and a hundred years earlier? The classical scholar, thankful when his archetypes are not more than ten times as distant in date from their originals, may too readily assume that a text of this date is necessarily better than one of A.D. 250. But it at least needs to be proved; and the full acceptance of Professor Clark's canon would leave this proof as far away as ever.

---

[1] *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts.* By Albert C. Clark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

I shall of course attempt no discussion of the palaeographical case involved: a mere philologist has no business in that galley. I am able now[1] to refer to Sir F. G. Kenyon's criticism in the *Church Quarterly* for October 1914 (pp. 68-72), which relieves a non-expert from any uneasiness he might feel lest some obvious questions that occur to him may be impertinences. I am glad to find that I really was right in asking whether absolutely any omission of some length might not be proved to be an exact number of lines or pages, when the elasticity of the unit is taken into account. 'With this latitude of variation, the proof of omissions becomes as easy as a Bacon-Shakespearian cryptogram.' With this and other palaeographical objections Sir F. G. Kenyon riddles the new theory from stem to stern. Leaving this side of the case alone, I want to urge the claims of other interested parties whom Professor Clark keeps out of court. A proposal to canonise Codex Bezae compels us to hear the devil's advocate, and he cannot be forbidden to range beyond the narrow limits allowed by this book. Not that I am a candidate for that post. In bidding us bow down and worship in the Cambridge Library instead of the Vatican, Professor Clark is only bettering an instruction which all our newer textual critics have been giving us in a less extreme form. Hort usually treated D as an irredeemably bad egg. Professor Clark labels it 'fresh,' though not quite 'new-laid.' My own opinion is that parts of it are excellent, but nature rebels against swallowing it whole.

---

[1] I should explain that this review was written six months ago, and lost in the post, so that I have had to re-write it after much time has been lost.

It will be noticed that in this matter the new doctrine involves a curious inversion of Hort's. For the great Cambridge master D was not worth a walk down King's Parade unless it left out something which the other MSS. contained. Oxford now comes to assure us that the Cantabrigiensis must be followed, except when it yields to the universal failing and perpetrates an omission. We are, it seems, to class the β-text[1] omission of Mark xvi. 9-20, and the δ-text omissions in Luke's Passion narrative, as accidental, and reflecting an archetype in which the omission covered an exact number of lines. It will probably occur to most readers that it is strange to explain the omission of the last paragraph of a book by a theory depending on calculation of so many lines omitted. Are we intended to assume that the scribe wrote as far as ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, went off to dinner, and on his return forgot where he was and turned over a page? It seems much simpler to assume, as is usually done, that the archetype of all our MSS. and versions was a roll which had lost its conclusion, frayed off, as so often happens, at the end.

The book consists almost entirely of elaborate enumerations as to the omissions found in several of the great MSS., and the Greek copy which underlies the Lewis Syriac version. These omissions are classified according to the number of letters left out, and exercises in G.C.M. tell us the length of line in the original. Thus ℵ, itself written with 13 or 14 letters a line, 'is derived from an ancestor with an average of 10-12 letters'; another ancestor is suspected with a longer line. The other Sinai document is similarly analysed. Professor Clark counts 485 places in its underlying Greek where 10 letters and over are omitted. Of these 196 involve 10-12 letters, 32 drop 20-22, and six 31. It may be easily admitted that in these cases, or a large number of them, the accidental omission of one, two, or three lines in the Greek text might supply a *vera causa* for a translator's aberration. The phenomena of Ciceronian MSS., Professor Clark's starting-point, assure us that the best literary scribes were prone to err this way.

---

[1] I use Kenyon's notation, and wish Professor Clark had done the same.

The table for the Lewis Syriac suggests, however, that we must lay more emphasis than readers generally will upon Professor Clark's own caveats that 'much must have been due to accident,' and that certain classes of omissions 'go back to an earlier stage in the development.' There are 124 instances where 13-16 letters are involved, 48 of 17-19, 35 of 23-28, and 10 of 33-37; and we have a collection of longer omissions ranging over a great variety of totals—41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 65, 70, 83, 128, 132, 167, and 262 letters. Stress is laid on these last, since 'mere accident, apart from line-division, becomes less likely' as the omissions become longer. 'Most of the omissions were made in a previous copy': the immediate model was probably one with 14-16 letters per line, accounting for 78 of these omissions, but most of the omissions are assigned on internal evidence to the smaller unit. When we have two divisors like 10-12 and 14-16 to operate with, we feel that the bed of Procrustes is very accommodating. Let us call these respectively a and b, and allow each symbol the three values given. The first six of the 'longer omissions' for which numbers are given above become thus $4a$ (*i.e.*, $3\times10+11$), $3b$ ($2\times14+15$), $3b$ ($14+2\times15$), and similarly $3b$, $3b$, $3b$—all three of which may also be $4a$, as their two predecessors may be. In the whole series the only members which will not fit *both* divisors are 41 ($4a$), 49 (neither), 50, 51 and 54 ($5a$), 65 ($6a$), and 83 ($8a$). Above 49, if my arithmetic is not astray, every possible number of letters can be expressed in complete lines of 10, 11, or 12 letters; above 97, every number can similarly be expressed in 14, 15, or 16 letters. There are, moreover, only 11 possible omissions of over nine letters which could not be expressed as xa, only 36 of over 13 letters which could not be xb. Even small omissions therefore, given two such elastic units, have an excellent chance of being adaptable to one line or the other, especially when we are at liberty to retain or drop moveable -ν, to spell αι or ε, ει or ι at will, or write letters small at the end of a line as ℵ does constantly. Since then Professor Clark's explanation will account for absolutely any omission of ten letters and over, are we not cherishing a natural instinct when we feel shy of a pill that will cure everything?

For when we proceed to look into these omissions we find that the Lewis shares a good many of them with authorities of different classes. In Tischendorf's apparatus we find company for it in Mark ix. 3 X *a n*, Luke vi. 40 ΓΛ* 48^{ev}, Luke xx. 19 Marcion (who also omitted τὸν λαὸν before), John v. 12 ΓΛ* al^{6} *b*, Luke xii. 9 *e* syr^{cod}, Luke xiv. 27 M*RΓal mu, Matthew v. 47 *k* (and Tatian, says von Soden), Matthew v. 30 D. Are these independent errors arising from similar causes, or must we find some common ancestry? The difficulty here is, however, nothing to that in which Professor Clark's passion for inclusiveness lands him in two notable passages, where he is certainly the first to recognise veritable Holy Writ. In Matt. xxvii. 49

ℵB add what Hort called a very early interpolation, taken from John xix. 34, almost verbatim. It makes absolute havoc of the sense, but Professor Clark ‘ would merely point out that the passage may well represent six lines of the archetype ’ (p. 56). And when we come to the last page of Mark, the ingenious theory is offered that the ‘ Shorter Conclusion,’ which stands first in the two or three MSS. that contain it, is original, and the ‘ Longer Conclusion ’ follows it up and expands it. I notice, however, that the new interpolation found in W is a little too much for even such faith to digest. And yet it could indisputably have been written so as to occupy an exact number of complete lines : the formulae 46*a* and 33*b* (as above) will represent it equally well.

I venture to think that the most significant lesson of Professor Clark's failure is the impossibility of helping forward the solution of very complex problems by employing one method and closing our eyes to the rest. We are tempted to such behaviour by the instinct which forbids every scholar to tread in unfamiliar fields ; and we cannot but sympathise with this great specialist in Cicero when he refuses to discuss Synoptic Problems, or other sides of New Testament textual criticism which lie outside the method he has chosen to set forth. But since his method will apply to absolutely any omission except the shortest, we cannot possibly exclude the consideration of alternative accounts. In Matthew v. 30 it is no doubt easy to say that the omission was in a common ancestor of D and the Lewis, where thirteen lines of the shorter unit, or nine of the longer, were dropped by homoeoteleuton. But this Logion comes to us from both of our main Synoptic sources ; and the addition of a saying about the right hand can be easily assigned to Mark ix. 43, which was taken over in a shortened form in the doublet at Matthew xviii. 8. The omission is therefore right, as those of D so often are, even in places where Westcott and Hort did not apply their principle.

It will be well at this point to hear the conclusion of the whole matter, as expressed in the last paragraph of the book. 'The oldest text is that quoted by the earliest Fathers and rendered in the most ancient versions.' As against the β-text (Hort's 'Neutral'), which 'can claim no earlier testimony on its behalf than the partial support of Origen,' the δ-family ('Western') 'presents the text which was used by the predecessors of Origen, and can boast of a series of witnesses going back to the generation which succeeded the Apostles. In Z [the δ-text], therefore, I recognise the primitive text.' Quotations follow from P. Corssen and Professor Burkitt, which, however, are not as congruous as Professor Clark seems to regard them. The former, in 1892, set down the β-text as 'merely the reflection of a recension capriciously formed in the fourth century, which, like every modern version, must have been subjective in character.' This sounds well, but one would like to know how we are to avoid subjectivity. If Z is to be accepted solidly (except in its omissions !), we must know how to find Z, and it is largely an unknown quantity. Professor Burkitt's words are more helpful. 'Let us come out of the land of Egypt, and let us see whether the agreement of East and West, of Edessa and Carthage, will not give us a surer basis on which to establish our text of the Gospels.' We must put that earlier dictum with teaching which Professor Burkitt has given us more recently, proving that the Old Syriac is really 'Western' in readings it shared with the Old Latin and got from Tatian, but genuinely Antiochene of a very early date in places where it differs from Tatian. The isolation of this very early Antioch text gives us three primitive types, Antiochene, Western, and Egyptian; and the agreement of two of these gives us the most hopeful method of escaping subjectivity. But to edit with completeness and certainty either the Antiochene or the Western text is unhappily beyond our present resources, even if we allow that Westcott and Hort gave us approximately what is now generally regarded as a third (not 'fourth') century Egyptian revision.

Let us assume, however, that we are to ignore the β-text, and take the early Egyptian record from the Sahidic and Clement. In the Gospels we have the Old Syriac to help us, but we shall have some difficulty in catching the voice of Edessa when we come to the Acts. This suggests a question to which Professor Clark gives us no answer. What are we to do when the δ-text is not shorter or longer than the β-text, but simply different? In the Acts we have a large number of additions in D, which I gather Professor Clark would accept almost *en bloc*, since they could all of them be expressed in *στίχοι*. Here I should very often be tempted to agree, as for instance in regard to the statement (Acts xix. 9) that Paul used the lecture-room during the heat of the day, while Tyrannus was enjoying his siesta: whether internal evidence is always, or even generally, as convincing, I should gravely doubt. But when D or its fellows make a statement differing largely in words but not in fact, are we bound to accept its form, just because the text as a whole has earlier attestation? Has Professor Clark really faced the difficulty of preferring δ to β (or even α!) in a very large number of places? The harmonising tendencies of δ are alone sufficient to forbid the short and easy method of accepting δ (when known), with supplements from β when δ yields to the scribes' besetting sin of omission. The influence of Harmonies was bound to cause much assimilation of parallel records; and it seems a perfectly sound canon that we should generally prefer a reading which involves a difference to one which may be due merely to assimilation. And can we really doubt that many variations in D and the Old Latin are due to mere paraphrase, and have no intrinsic claim to be preferred to the familiar alternative? Professor Clark boldly argues (p. 81) that in Acts 'the

Greek MSS. in general were drawn from a single ancestor written in στίχοι, such as those found in D, and had in a number of cases omitted lines of their original.' Before we can possibly accept this, we must study the text of D, which is assumed to be free from the infection of this imperfect archetype, and apply to it a variety of tests, the consideration of which Professor Clark excludes. Is there really any probability that this all-round examination will be other than eclectic in its results ?

I venture to close this notice with a word of personal opinion, though with the diffidence appropriate in one whose study of New Testament textual criticism is not that of a specialist. I have, however, qualified perhaps for one contribution by a protracted study of orthography as established for vernacular Greek of the first century by our various new evidence. I have been much struck by the number of cases in which the old uncials preserve spellings which can be proved current in the time of the autographs, but obsolete long before the fourth century. Faithful in minutiæ, they might reasonably be expected to be faithful also in greater matters. Anyhow, orthography seems to demonstrate the dependence of ℵ and B as well as D upon exemplars of at least the second century : that all three include later elements is of course not excluded. Is it not possible to explain 'the hypothesis that gross licence began to reign in sub-Apostolic times, but that the "neutral" text was preserved in some unknown place' (p. 111), which Professor Clark thinks 'most violent and in itself very unlikely,' by reference to the conditions under which the Christians' sacred books must have been handed down through ages of persecution ? Cicero was copied in scriptoria : having secured the orator's head, the proscription apparently did not try to suppress even the Philippics. But how often was the scriptorium used for the Gospels ? Little books, like Hort's archetype of C in the Apocalypse, copied often by 'prentice hands, with many abbreviations and a generally non-literary form, must have made up largely the ancestry of the sumptuous codices written in the days of peace. Nor were the scribes mechanical copyists. They lived when oral tradition was abundant and highly valued, and when no canonical sanctity protected the written text. If an itinerant preacher repeated a Logion he had heard long ago from an apostolic man, it was sure to be copied into some more or less appropriate place in a Gospel, and transferred from margin to text at the next copying. The copyists, moreover, had the substance of their text by heart. They needed it constantly when no copy was available, and it was usually not safe to carry their books about. It was easy therefore to relapse into paraphrase. The confusion of the Old Latin text, as witnessed by Jerome, and by the infinite variety of our extant MSS., presents conditions suggestively similar; and we might perhaps even say the same of the Old Syriac, if the differences between our two witnesses may be to some extent credited to such a cause. The text therefore was peculiarly liable to interpolation, if by this we only mean the insertion of matter not due to the original author. We may both endorse the omission of these by β or δ text, and hold the conviction that they often preserved an authentic tradition. Will not such considerations dispose of Professor Clark's contention that it is easier to omit than to invent?

I suggest therefore that we are free to give the δ-text very much greater weight than Hort conceded, and frankly to make the β-text a revision, but to prefer the latter still in most places where omissions are not concerned. We assume that Alexandrian scholars in the third century—possibly under Origen's inspiration—felt themselves driven by the existing chaos to attempt for the Greek very much what Jerome was later attempting for the Latin. They must have used some MSS. which stood very near the autographs, and were largely free from the licence which almost everybody feels compelled to credit to the 'Western' developments. This leaves us full liberty to believe that the revisers often wrongly rejected δ readings. Till the experts succeed in tracing some new principle which will objectively sift them, we must still continue to write on the margin of our Westcott and Hort those δ variants which take our individual fancy.

As to the plea that the β-text has no patristic backing, I would suggest that if these postulated early MSS. were prior to the processes that produced the new elements in the δ-text, their survival in a centre of learning might even be unknown till scholars unearthed them. Even a single copy, recognised as very old and good by the instinct of a scholar like Origen, might easily have been responsible for most of the material brought in by the revisers, who gave it a precedence very much like that of B in Hort's regard. The revision need never have become popular, or even known outside Alexandria or Egypt. The time of its production was not favourable, and the δ-text was at least as hard to dislodge as the Genevan Version was when challenged by the Authorised. And meanwhile the a-text was on its way, evolved when the Church had left outward danger behind, and was free to devote herself to doctrinal discussions that made an authoritative recension necessary. This was achieved under the inspiration of the instinct which Professor Clark so heartily approves. A net which gathered of every kind, it took in δ elements and β, as well as its own mostly stylistic novelties; and this inclusiveness no doubt commended it. In a comparatively short time it had driven its older rivals from the field, not to yield its place to them until the nineteenth century was nearly over.

What has been said must suffice for the indications of my scepticism as to Professor Clark's case for D against B as our primary authority. I feel that his doctrine of omissions deserves careful consideration as a factor in very many places, though tests which he excludes from his survey prevent us from allowing it weight in very many more. I am abundantly ready to be convinced of the claim of D and its company to a hearing in multitudes of places where it was shut out by the great critics of Hort's school, and in no small proportion of them we should give their reading preference. But I do not see how we can give them blind allegiance; and I must confess that Professor Clark has not persuaded me to relax the 'smile' of incredulity with which we hear that such incongruous passages as the end of our Mark, or the Pericope Adulterae, are to be taken as composed for the places they now occupy, even if they did hold that place as early as 150 A.D. But it need not be said that if Professor Clark does not carry our assent, a laborious and skilful argument like his must advance our knowledge by sending us back afresh to our first principles, to reinforce them with newly gathered argument, if not as he desires to abandon them for doctrines new and somewhat strange.

BRITISH AND GERMAN SCHOLARSHIP

WAR and scholarship have not in the abstract much to do with one another. The scholar is normally in a backwater where the tide of public life flows past him without ruffling his environment ; and men of affairs put him out of their reckoning as an excellent person who may be a national asset, but is very little qualified to be a national adviser. In this war, unique as it is in so many directions, the scholar has become a storm centre. The university professors of Germany are regarded in this country as responsible beyond any single class, except the bureaucracy itself, for the making of the atmosphere in which the war arose ; and one of their number, Treitschke, is held accountable almost in the first place of all. We are learning how a marvellously efficient system of national education, in a country where education counts more than in any other, has been skilfully organised by the ruling oligarchy to hypnotise a docile people into the right spirit. Very possibly the professors are in some danger of receiving too large a share of the credit for the figure Germany is now presenting to the world. But the fact is clear that the intellectuals, so far from seeing vividly and teaching irresistibly that war is a crime against humanity, have lent themselves to the militarist propaganda. They contributed very largely to the development of the temper which has been Germany's undoing. Fatally deficient in the saving gift of humour, the nation has developed a megalomania which imagines civilisation destined to die with itself. And the pity of it is that the men who must bear the blame of a terrible failure in a crisis where ideas weighed more than in any crisis in history, are men who in all branches of pure knowledge have been among the leaders of the world. They could interpret the face of the sky, but they knew not how to interpret the signs of the times. It is to be feared that were Plato revising his *Republic* with an experience gained in modern Europe, he would think twice and thrice before making the philosopher king.

In this paper we are not so much concerned to discuss the past as to look forward to the possibilities of the future. The difficulties of settlement are stupendous, and they depend so overwhelmingly on the issue of the war that we can hardly wonder if people turn impatiently from any discussion as premature. At present White and Black have alike lost a terrible number of pieces, but we feel very sure White has the winning position. Yet it remains wholly uncertain whether it is to be mate in ten moves or in a hundred, and it might be stalemate after all. Calculations based on any of these three possibilities, putting out of sight the unthinkable fourth, are liable to be wholly upset by the turn of events, and we can only wait. Still, as public opinion must have a great deal to do with the ultimate settlement, there should obviously be the most strenuous effort to prepare opinion without hurry, even if results are only contingent. And in any case there must be every effort to cultivate the temper in which alone both justice and humanity can operate. Indignation, stern and deep, can coexist with unsleeping vigilance lest we should be unjust to our enemy, or fail to allow for the forces which have deranged his better nature. Unflinching determination to use force, since we have been forced into it, till force is finally dethroned, is consistent with a master passion for reconciliation. Even the rough unthinking man of the world cannot deny that we shall have to live with the Germans somehow when the war is over; and it is worth his while to ask how we can keep them from cherishing schemes of revenge and preparing for it even under the severest system of repression. The Christian meanwhile—driven to make a choice of evils, in a world where the hardness of men's hearts is always making the ideal impossible—will never feel that we have conquered Germany till we have slain the enmity. We draw the sword with no less resolution because we draw it with horror and loathing; but we mean Love to have the last word when Belgium, and France, and Serbia, and Poland, and the dominions of the Turk, are all delivered from the god of battles into the hands of the God of Peace.

With these objects in view, we may turn to the special department with which this paper is concerned. German scholarship and science are naturally being canvassed vehemently in Britain to-day. One cannot be surprised if a general depreciation of things made in Germany extends to its hitherto acknowledged intellectual eminence. Noisy obscurantists are thanking God that they know no German, and declaring that the most mischievous things in our religious life are importations from over the Rhine. Yet it is not long since many of them were rejoicing over a German Daniel come to judgment, who was supposed to have seriously damaged an established theory of literary criticism in the Old Testament. On the other hand, we have heard first-rank scholars declaring that we have taken the Germans too much at their own valuation, to the detriment of our independence. It may be so, though the extent of this servility has been greatly exaggerated. The acceptance of German results on the part of British scholars is far more frequently due to the conscientious industry with which German research has done its work. Those who know accept, and those who do not know may cavil. It would be more dignified and more profitable if those who are interested simply in the advancement of knowledge would turn from such debates, and receive for rigid testing, and grateful acknowledgment when approved, the work of investigators in any nation.

Nothing but science and her votaries will suffer if research ceases to be cosmopolitan, and seekers after truth duplicate their investigations through refusal to read work already published in a foreign and hated tongue.

Much might be said, no doubt, of provocation that has come from German scholarship, arrogantly ignoring the best work of other nations, and suffering the nemesis which Science always inflicts on those who forget her first laws. But there has certainly been a marked improvement in recent years; and a real republic of letters never seemed nearer than it was when the great chasm suddenly opened between us and our fellow workers. One or two illustrations might be given from fields that are more familiar than other to the writer himself. Comparative Philology, a science which sprang out of an Englishman's daring guess, has been almost exclusively cultivated by German research. Yet the only first-rate manual of Greek and Latin philology produced in this country, since the new birth of the science under great German philologists thirty years ago, has been translated into German. The later history of Greek, developed into a new science by the pioneer work of German philologist and theologian, has been pursued under the fullest and happiest conditions of fellowship between British, French, German, and American scholars and explorers. In some fields, such as that of Iranian language and literature, German workers have little enough from Britain to quote, but use most freely what does come. Theology, so far as one may generalise on so many-sided a subject, is in a less happy condition, and German thought would be all the better for a larger knowledge of the best British work. But even there the enormous output may well be held largely responsible. Here, however, we may claim on this side that our leading theologians have rarely shown themselves ignorant of the best that has been done in Germany. Sometimes of course there has been unwarranted haste in accepting theories from a country whose scholars are generally stronger in collecting facts than in divining consequences. But British theology has far more often received and weighed to its own immense profit, proving all things with sane and cautious judgment, and holding fast only what is good.

Now the prominence of a number of exceedingly eminent German theologians, scholars, and scientists in the paper defence of their country at the present time has started some natural problems in the minds of educated Britons. It must be admitted that these leaders of intellect show few of the qualities we should have expected from men trained to examine evidence and decide dispassionately on momentous issues. The most rigidly neutral critic might safely be invited to compare the temper of pleas by distinguished British and German intellectual and spiritual leaders, as printed in the three first numbers of *Goodwill.* Is there anything from the German side to compare in fairness and freedom from bitterness with Professor Sanday's pamphlet or Mr. Clutton-Brock's *Thoughts on the War*—to name only two out of many? We have Professor Wundt not only accepting guilelessly the forged speech of Mr. John Burns, and sundry other fairy stories which perhaps he has no means of testing, but showing such grotesque incapacity to read the English character that we begin to reflect with amazement that he is the author of a notable book on *Völkerpsychologie.* We have the two manifestoes by theologians and leaders in foreign missionary enterprise, sincere and poignant in the extreme, and full of the distress which any real Christian must feel in the fearful rending of Western Christianity. But even here patent facts are astonishingly distorted. Belgium is not mentioned in the first: in the second our British Reply has brought out a defence through which a child can see—the fact that Belgium had tried to make some provisional arrangement for help, when faced with strategic railways concentrated on her frontier, is regarded as cancelling her neutrality! Harnack makes the same point in his reply to British Free Churchmen (*Goodwill*, p. 33); and he shows the same incapacity to understand our veneration for the 'scrap of paper,' which for our Government and our nation turned the scale last August. Nor do any of them make any allusion to Sir Edward Grey's entreaty to the German Government to propose an alternative course if his own proposal of a conference were unacceptable. These will serve as typical examples of the blindness and unfairness of men from whom penetration and judicial temper might have been expected. Can we explain the failure? A great many intelligent and serious men put the matter away as not needing an explanation. They simply assume that the mask of civilisation has been torn from a people who are barbarians at bottom:

Not five in five score,
But ninety-five more.

An explanation which merely falls back on original sin gives us as little light on the past as it gives hope for the future. We know some of these men, and we shall not be persuaded by all the journalists in concert that such men were insincere in their friendship, secretly toasting 'The Day' when they pretended to desire nothing but peace. It is a truer psychology which points out that national panic is capable of producing very strange symptoms in men normally sober and humane. We know something of the German public's ignorance of events which all the world knows, their confident belief in a whole mythology with its scene laid in Britain: the national genius for thoroughness has had full scope in the official news department. Join this imperfect information with the anxiety, public and private, resulting from the hope of victory deferred and now becoming more than doubtful, and we can more or less understand how men with the German temperament should have lost in time of need so many qualities for which they once were distinguished. Harnack himself—to take one eminent example—whose daughter has been widowed by a British bullet, has evidently failed to apply to the British case against Germany the impartiality he would show in a discussion on New Testament criticism. Such suggestions are not made as if they excused the violence and futility of famous scholars who in this controversy have damaged nothing but their own reputation. There may be other elements in the diagnosis of which we necessarily know nothing. But before we cast out their names as evil, let us remember what we thought of them this time last year. And let us reflect that they stand with men whose practical Christian enthusiasm showed itself by many infallible proofs, leaders of missionary enterprise who sat with us in the World Conference at Edinburgh, influential churchmen who were labouring earnestly and successfully in the cause of Anglo-German friendship. If the key to their present behaviour is nothing but a blind patriotism which overwhelms both heart and head, we may well give up human nature as an insoluble riddle.

To analyse scientifically the psychology of German scholarship at the present time is an interesting problem, but not the most practical to which we can address ourselves just now. We have to ask what the future relations will be between British and German fellow workers. This is only a section of the general question which will be the first of all questions when the war is over; but in view of the immense weight of the scholar class in Germany it becomes a matter of the utmost importance that Britons who come into relations with them should have the right end in view, and pursue it with insight, firmness, and sympathy.

First among all our duties as thinkers or church workers must obviously be the checking of tendencies to Prussianise our own country. These tendencies are by no means imaginary. Among recent utterances of leading intellectuals among us the fine fighting speech of Professor Ridgeway from the chair of the Classical Association is specially worth noting. A vigorous denunciation of mere subservience to German theorising leads up to a frank acceptance of the most decadent of all Treitschke's dogmas.[1] A condition of unbroken peace would, it seems, 'be the greatest calamity that ever befell the human race. Such a condition means the death of all that is noblest and the growth and prosperity of all that is vilest. . . . In a world of perfect peace humanity would perish from its own physical and moral corruption.' That the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount involve such disasters had not occurred to most of us; and the present is not the happiest time to preach Treitschke and Bernhardi as nobler and more robust evangelists than the original four. If Britain is going to win in this appalling war, it will be through being herself, and not a debased copy of Germany. The drill sergeant as we know him has done his own appointed work to admiration; and he has no ambition to take charge of departments of our national life in which he has no place. The invasion of the voluntary principle by the Prussian ideal would infallibly ruin our most characteristic virtues, without importing the Prussian efficiency.

In other directions, however, we shall certainly do well *et ab hoste doceri*. There is no reason why our scholarship as well as our business life should not go much further than ever before on the road of German industry, thoroughness, and tireless attention to detail. A large meeting of manufacturers was recently told by a legal and scientific expert that 'the English dislike study. The Englishman is excellent in making the best of the means at his disposal, but he is almost hopeless in one thing. He will not prepare himself by intellectual work for the task that he has to do.'[1] The indictment is not without force even among professed scholars in our country. To be lavish of pains in order to attain perfect familiarity with that corner of a big subject in which one hopes to advance knowledge, is a condition of success which the Germans have learnt better than we. The learning of this lesson will not impair but only enhance that gift of divination in which the British scholar at his best excels the German. It will certainly do a great deal to make the ignoring of British work absolutely impossible in future generations.

---

[1] 'Unconscious acceptance,' one should rather say: Professor Ridgeway nowhere suggests that he fathers this dogma on its most conspicuous advocate. He would be the first to shrink from the logical consequences of the doctrine.

There is no reason to fear that the collapse of the German military conspiracy will interpose more than a temporary check to the fellowship of research. For a time, of course, feeling is certain to be bitter. The study of the 'North American and West Swiss' languages in Germany will be impeded by the sheer difficulty of getting natives of Britain and France to go and live among a deeply resentful people. But here scholars of the Allied nations, if true to their own ideals, can pursue quietly and tactfully the work of reconciliation. The *ultima ratio* of all research is international co-operation. Never has this been more finely shown than by the famous Berlin theologian, Professor Adolf Deissmann, in his paper on 'International and Interdenominational Research of the New Testament.'[2] And at the head of this most catholic exposition, written in the spring of 1914, there stands the significant comment: 'Upon the Editor's request and after consultation with Dr. Harnack, Dr. Deissmann has agreed that the article shall be published in spite of the present situation.' A great pioneer scholar thus leaves on record his estimate of the indispensable service that British and German scholarship can render to one another and to the cause of knowledge. There must inevitably be severe provocation for some time to come in the writings of many German scholars, who are sure to ignore when they can, and scold when they cannot ignore. But the true princes of learning will most successfully resist temptation, and on our side there should be a minimum of reprisals. We in Britain shall necessarily be much less isolated than in the past. National sympathies will draw together the scholars of France, Russia, Belgium, Italy, Holland, Sweden, America, and our own country, to the great advantage of all; and a country where knowledge is so prized as it is in Germany will not long be content with aloofness. Our own aim should be to welcome imports from German workshops and appraise them with unfailing impartiality, biding our time till the exports of British learning are equally free in passage. When we have repelled the grisly horror that threatens the world, we can afford to be generous and tactful towards the wounded patriotism of men by whose side we want to work once again, as in the happier days before the evil spirit rose from the abyss to trouble the peace of mankind.

---

[1] Speech by Lord Moulton, F.R.S., at Manchester Town Hall, December 8, 1914.

[2] *Constructive Quarterly*, December 1914, pp. 786-804.

All this our scholars will do by instinct, by the virtue of a tradition of chivalry which our great nation has not to learn now for the first time. But the thinkers of the world will have a higher function yet. This war has been influenced by ideas beyond all wars in history. A titanic struggle, which posterity could hardly match in mere bigness if the loathing bred by it proved insufficient to teach the lesson of peace, has brought out with unimagined vividness what is the meaning of the Will to Power. It has been 'war in heaven'—Michael and his angels arrayed against the Devil of Nietzsche. Before the war on earth began, we could see the strife in the heavenly places, where thoughts meet in the clash of warfare before they materialise down below. In Britain no less than in Germany the doctrine of force was being proclaimed;

and the right of the strong to do as he willed with his own was set forth in our reviews with barefaced effrontery that made old-fashioned people blush and gasp. Now the consequences of the new morality are before the eyes of all mankind, and men who have suffered from it will be less inclined to regard it as an improvement on the old. It is often said that force cannot destroy the cult of force. But force can only reign while successful, and when defeated on its own field no longer commands the adoration of its blind votaries. The world waits eagerly for the discrediting of the grim idol before which ghastly hecatombs have been offered with blood and tears beyond all thought. Soon, we believe, Moloch will be dragged from his pedestal, and some other object of worship will be set in the empty shrine. Can we doubt what this will be? The Tempter offered universal sovereignty to the Son of Man, were He only ready to bow before him and hold the throne in fief from the first creator of the Will to Power. He has tempted the nations all too successfully in every age, and in this colossal strife we see the effects of yielding. Surely now the weary nations will turn to the only rival claimant for that throne. Philosophers will preach a new idealism, historians will bring new morals from the accumulated experience of the past, biologists will show that men do not live by bread alone, or survive in the struggle for existence by the use of the mailed fist. And so, illuminated in heart and mind by salutary pain, the intellectual leaders of the nations will enthrone at last the one true Superman, and He shall reign in His own right to the ends of the earth.

POSTSCRIPT.—*The above pages were passed for press before the publication of Sir John French's report on the effects of the German poison-gases, and, of course, before the sinking of the* Lusitania. *By these crimes, and by the poisoning of wells in South Africa, official Germany has shown that there is no longer a conscience to appeal* *to ; and if it proves that German civilians, including the professors, applaud these deeds, or even abstain from denouncing them, we must feel that the gulf between Germany and the civilised world, first opened at Louvain and Rheims, has become too wide for us to bridge till time and God's Spirit have brought contrition. The writer of this paper would only urge that the Christian attitude remains unchanged, although indefinitely harder for flesh and blood to attain. Our supreme fear must be that uncontrollable indignation may sweep our own people into acts which would be unworthy of ourselves. May God preserve us from even the most attenuated contagion of such foulness !*

A CAMBRIDGE ORIENTAL SCHOLAR[1]

There is no little danger that this fascinating biography may be overlooked by the general public, which proverbially knows nothing of its greatest men. Cowell was not a successful soldier, or a popular scientist, or a tolerable under-secretary. He was only a scholar—a man of stupendous learning, better realised in Germany than in his own country, and withal a man of simplest piety and a modesty which struck the most casual observer. Never was Hort's splendid saying better exemplified than in his fellow professor : ' A life devoted to truth is a life of vanities abased and ambitions forsworn.' Intellectually and morally towering as he did above the great majority of men who live in the public eye, he was known to educated Englishmen, if known at all, only as the man who introduced Omar Khayyam to his friend, Edward FitzGerald. To his pupils and the small circle of his friends the biography will come with fragrant memories. One of these pupils brings in this short review his tribute of reverent affection to the teacher with whom he worked for fifteen years, in the hope that a wider circle may seek in the book itself acquaintance with a man who even in this distant way must win the love of all that read about him.

Before turning to the subject of the memoir, a few words may be said as to the biographer's work. The unpretending task of selecting letters and connecting them with narrative has devolved upon a cousin of the Professor, a distinguished member of the medical profession. We need not complain that the work was not entrusted to an expert in the field of study in which Cowell won his fame. There would probably have been too much that is technical introduced, and the book would have been forbidding to the general reader, who may enjoy this biography without fear of being pulled up over things he cannot understand. The only danger of that kind, indeed, falls on the Orientalist, or other expert reader in Cowell's own line, who will not often be able to follow the pages in which the indulgent doctor allows his hero to expatiate on his favourite hobby of botany. It would, however, have been well if some Orientalist had revised the proofs. The inconsistent and incorrect spelling with which Sanskrit and other Eastern words are often defaced must prove rather irritating to experts and perplexing to novices, The 'Shárnámah' (frequently) is rather dreadful, while 'Morganlänlandische' (p. 349) and 'Wessenchafen' (p. 331) show that Western languages do not come off unscathed. On the whole the classics fare better, though 'the heroic muse of Ermius' (p. 81) will not be recognised at once, nor will the student of Herodotus relish the Greek of Hippocleides' 'danced off' marriage (p. 337).[1]

---

[1] *Life and Letters of Edward Byles Cowell, Professor of Sanskrit, Cambridge, 1867-1903.* By George Cowell, F.R.C.S.

Xenophon of Ephesus would have been better off without his date than with the epoch of his famous classical namesake attached to him (p. 73): the poor man figures on p. 327 as Zenophon. The appalling mention of 'Professor Tebb' on p. 346 must go into the same category, as an outrage on the identity of the greatest living Hellenist. The last, together with 'professional' for 'professorial,' occurs in a letter from Dr. Peile, the Master of Christ's, whose calligraphy, as we can testify, gives scanty excuse for such misrepresentations. In the two short examples of Cowell's own Sanskrit versification greater care has been exercised. That with which he greeted his section of the London Oriental Congress from the presidential chair has only one misprint (p. 326); and his golden wedding day 'çlokas' (p. 352) have only two, and one of these—the merest trifle—was in Cowell's own printed copy. But mistakes in more serious matters are particularly regrettable as compromising the master's scholarship with tyros who will not think of accusing transcriber or printer. Such is the translation 'thou art thou' (instead of 'that'), which on p. 381 Cowell is made to give for the Vedântist 'great sentence' tat tvam asi. Unfortunately, this does not stand alone.

---

[1] 'Απεχρήσατο is, however, so intelligent a misquotation that I do not feel sure whether it may not be a lapse of Cowell's own memory.

But now we may turn away from our fault-finding, with which no doubt the general reader is already rather impatient. But really we must justify our office by picking some holes somewhere, and Mr. George Cowell will not complain of being found to be less at home with the dictionary than with the lancet. For the present reviewer this book recalls, in the most welcome and effective way, memories that are very sacred. Our dear Guru, as we called him to one another, will live in our thoughts more for what he was than for what he knew. Yet how much such a statement means even his pupils could hardly say. We knew that he had a knowledge quite unique in Europe of the most perplexing works of Sanskrit philosophy; that it would be unsafe to say which modern Indian dialects he was not at home in; that he took a weekly class in the Pâli Jâtakas, and superintended their publication in English; that he was a past master in Persian literature, and that he had gaily plunged into the Avesta and the Inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes in order to read with two or three philological tripos candidates; that he revelled like a Macaulay in the highroads and bypaths of Greek and Latin literature; that he took his recreation in Spanish and Welsh; and that he had a fearful and wonderful knowledge of wild flowers. His biographer tells us that the virus of flower-hunting was injected by himself, when the Professor had been some years at Cambridge, to cure his sedentary habits by providing a motive for long walks. We also learn that his chair in Calcutta University was one of History! That this list approximates to completeness is unlikely enough. I remember noting in his library a Talmud in forty volumes odd, and he is not likely to have left it unstudied. The Old Testament, in any case, he read as an expert: he tells us (p 335) how he had long ago taught his wife Hebrew, so that she knew the Psalms and Isaiah well. These statements will serve as samples, and may be supplemented from the present volume with abundant evidence that he was very far from neglecting the greatest of all his literatures—that of his own country. But all this learning was kept so carefully under cover that we could only trace it when it outcropped in some apposite illustration, or modestly revealed itself in answer to a question. We were always mentally fighting the impression that we had really come to give instead of to receive, so constantly was he appealing to our judgment, and welcoming our suggestions. That he read with us for his own pleasure, quite as much as for our profit, was obvious antecedently from the fact that more than half of his classes were in subjects outside the limits of his chair, neither included in his professorial duties nor undertaken for fees. But that made no difference in the urgency of his invitation. If, as in my own case during the time, there was no one else reading the subject, he worked it up with the same enthusiasm; and he let his friend go, at the peremptory call of The Leys bell hard by, with reluctance which demanded all one's firmness, if duty prevented the prolongation of pleasure. To see such perfervid zeal for learning was an education in itself, and the example of his childlike humility and simplicity was treasure more golden still.

The life of a scholar is usually told in few words, and Cowell's has no incidents to make it exciting. The eldest son of an Ipswich merchant, he was born in

1826, and educated at the Grammar School. When only sixteen he lost his father, and had to go into the business, sorely against all his tastes; but he stuck to it with characteristic resolution, and consoled himself with long evenings over his books. Soon he was stepping outside the classical field into Persian, and cherishing eager desires to take up Sanskrit. He was beginning Sanskrit grammar, visiting Thomas Carlyle, and making the first steps in his long friendship with FitzGerald, before he was twenty-one. But he was still in his teens when he came under the influence which had more to do with shaping his career than anything else whatsoever. The chance meeting with Elizabeth Charlesworth at Bramford, near Ipswich, was the beginning of a love story that never outgrew its earliest charm. We who gathered in the drawing-room at Scroope Terrace, Cambridge, to give our congratulations to Darby and Joan on their golden wedding, can never think of the one without the other, or forget the beauty of a fellowship so simple and so perfect. Mrs. Cowell was fourteen years his senior, and when she married the shy student of twenty-one, she very soon led him on in directions which he would never have dared alone. She came of a literary family, and had herself already published poems which merited popularity, to judge from some quotations in this book. Her younger sister, Maria Charlesworth, wrote that charming and healthy book *Ministering Children*, which is, I suppose, forgotten now, but not in favour of books better deserving their vogue. Mrs. Cowell soon set herself to supply certain obvious gaps in her husband's composition. She entered with enthusiasm into his studies, and became his willing fellow-learner. The non-survival of their correspondence must, I fancy, be explained by the theory that the letters were wanted as 'copy' when he began to publish Oriental grammars. In later life she joined with him in many of his linguistic excursions, as well as in the botanical rambles; and if the motive of helping him by her companionship did predominate over that of sheer scholarly zeal, there was quite enough of the latter to enable her to dissemble excellently if ever she was less interested than he. Her first task was to offer herself as a substitute for the ambition with which Nature had forgotten to endow her. She determined that he should give up the uncongenial counting-house and enter the life for which he was clearly designed. At last she got her way, and in 1850 Cowell matriculated at Oxford. There he pursued his Oriental studies, wrote an epoch-making Prâkrit Grammar, taught FitzGerald Persian, and as a kind of byplay took a first in Lit. Hum. The next move was for some time an anxious matter, but ultimately, in 1856, the Cowells left England for him to take up a professorship in the University of Calcutta. They stayed there till 1864, he soon adding to his history teaching the more congenial work of presiding over the Sanskrit College. We have some glimpses of the Mutiny, which stirred even Cowell's gentle soul to language startlingly unlike his usual style. After accomplishing in seven years work that would have more than decently filled thirty, he came home on grounds of health, and did not return. A chair of Sanskrit was founded at Cambridge, and he became a candidate, his rival being Professor Anprecht, the well-known editor of the *Rigveda*.

Cowell's canvass largely consisted in impressing on the electors how fine a scholar Anprecht was, but the University made the right choice, and thirty-six years of superbly productive labour opened in 1867. They were, however, years without events, till the golden wedding in 1896, followed so soon by Mrs. Cowell's failure of health and her death, in 1899, at the age of eighty-seven. Cowell bore up bravely, but none of us expected that he would be long in rejoining her. He died on February 9, 1903, a few days after his seventy-seventh birthday. The little Bramford churchyard witnessed the closing scene, as far as this world could see, of the long and beautiful companionship which began there just sixty years before. A few words must be given to the scholar before we go back to the man. My own estimate of his powers is necessarily coloured to some extent by the fact that I could not long find time for his Veda Classes, and never read with him in Indian philosophy—the field in which by general consent his greatest strength lay. He took up the study of the Avesta years after he came to Cambridge, and he never wrote on the subject, though again and again in his letters published here he shows the peculiar enthusiasm with which he pursued it. His amazing acquisitive faculty perhaps impressed me most. He seldom ventured original proposals of his own for the interpretation of difficult texts, but he grasped with unerring clearness the various views of scholars who had attacked them, and decided between them with unvarying saneness of judgment. His memory was, till near the end, extraordinarily retentive, and enabled him to produce illustrations from a field of literature the width of which can hardly have been paralleled. The power of collecting, retaining, and interpreting the thoughts of others, whether the writers themselves or the scholars who have translated or edited their works, he possessed in the highest degree, and it was by virtue of this that he rendered his unique service to the cause of Oriental study. He was not an Orientalist of the stamp well represented by James Darmesteter, whose early death France and the world of scholarship mourned ten years ago. A daring original thinker, who goes his own way and strikes out his own paths, is needed once or twice in the history of any linguistic study ; but it is possible that his very brilliance may divert him into paradox, as was the case with Darmesteter himself. Except at certain rare epochs in the development of a study, the man who is most needed is the sober, plodding student of boundless industry and memory which lets nothing go. Such was Cowell. He was not a man to fascinate the learned world with brilliant discoveries, or to re-create the East, in his friend FitzGerald's way, with poetry that bestowed upon its professed original more than it received therefrom. He did translate indeed, as the copious specimens in this book show. They exhibit a correct ear and an easy flow, but we cannot imagine that if Cowell had himself done *OmarKhayyam* into English verse the result would have fluttered any publisher's heart. The Professor was meant for other work—work such as the English scholar is less content than the German to do—'spade-work,' without which no worthy building can have an adequate foundation. And, while contentedly giving his life to this unseen labour, the worth of which the outside world would never know, he was by his learning, his enthusiasm, and his personal charm creating an Oriental school in the great University which he served so well. His one ambition was perfectly expressed in the Sanskrit stanza with which he returned his pupil's greeting on the occasion already described, and his own version of it may fitly sum up this sketch of a career assured by solid results that will last for generations :

High on his rock the lonely scholar stands—
  A mountain pine that spreads no sheltering shade;
Rather grow old amid fresh student bands—
  A banyan with its native colonnade.

This short tribute is meant to be only a signpost to point readers to the book, from which extracts could not be given in any adequate degree without unduly stretching our limits. We must, however, before closing, mention a few traits of his character which have given this book great charm, even to readers entirely innocent of Indian lore. First among these must come his religion. In early manhood, when his wife's enterprise carried him off from business to University, there was some thought of his taking orders. His call to other work was, however, unmistakable ; and, as it ultimately appeared, he was destined to do more effective Christian work in Calcutta as professor than he could have done as missionary. His pupils there were very soon bound to him by a tie of admiration on account of his unrivalled knowledge of their own literature, and a tie of affection such as throughout life he could not help inspiring in all who sat at his feet. When therefore he set himself to teach the truths of Christianity to those who cared to come to his house on Sunday afternoons, we can well believe that the effect was profound. I have been told that that class is remembered still after more than forty years. It is a vivid illustration of the influence that can be exerted by an English civil servant in India, in the all too rare cases where the representative of the imperial race holds with fervour the faith in the light of which England's greatness has grown up. Cowell writes from India of his reading the story of the Madagascan martyrs, and passing it on to his students, to whom he expounded his conviction that 'as the attacks seem to thicken against the external evidences of Christianity the internal evidences are only more and more strengthened.' Truly a timely sentence for to-day. We read how he would take voluntary classes in the New Testament, in his house, or in a room near the college, attended by earnest and intelligent men, with whom he would often spend long hours in private, talking over their difficulties of belief and leading them persuasively to Christ. The testimonies which followed him on his return to England showed eloquently how many were brought to know the Saviour by his teaching and example. Thirty years afterwards we find him writing at length on a Sunday afternoon to one of these old pupils, and expressing in beautiful words the serenity of an old man's faith. His catholic spirit is well shown in a letter to his mother from India, for which I must break my rule and quote :

> You would have been a little startled at a letter I wrote to a Babu lately, whom I have helped by a recent correspondence in settling some Unitarian difficulties. He wanted to know the difference between Church and Dis-

sent. I told him they belonged to the region of *feeling*, not *conscience*. Those who by temperament admired antiquity and system, and held by the aristocratic part of our constitution, would always prefer the Church ; while the lovers of change and reform and the democratic principle would, as a rule, prefer Dissent. To my mind, any hymn-book or missionary history is a convincing proof that the Spirit's influence is diffused on *each*. The catholic hymns of the whole body are contributed by members of every denomination.

It is a truth the realisation of which on both sides would greatly soften the bitterness of religious strife. I am tempted to quote more, to illustrate the modesty, the sanity, the pleasant and gentle humour of a man who portrays himself with singular completeness in the unstudied letters that fill this fascinating volume. But I will close with one short extract, which combines an admirable estimate of his own powers and limitations with a beautiful allusion to that home life which all his friends looked upon with peculiar feeling of reverence in the presence of the truly divine :

> Your letter interested me very much, but I shall write no 'great book' now. Our life is shaped for us, and one must trust in the guiding hand. I have not the originality that makes a man produce 'great books' : my work is influencing others and setting them to work. Besides, there is another point which I must not forget. A happy married life does not help one in literary success. You will remember Bacon's phrase (from Cicero) about Ulysses : 'Qui vetulam suam praetulit immortalitati.' I am quite content that that line should be the verdict of my life, so long as one can honestly feel that 'he has served his generation by the will of God' before he 'falls on sleep.' It seems to me, as I survey the past, that only men of great original genius, and especially *poets*, have any chance of achieving immortality. All other writers only become 'peat,' as Carlyle says—sooner or later.

As we read these words we call up again the familiar figures that, till the latest years, we so often met walking side by side up the Trumpington Road into the country, on the quest of some favourite flower. The little, bent old lady in the quaint poke bonnet, out of which peered the kindly eyes that had flashed with keen intelligence a generation before to the conversation of Tennyson, FitzGerald, and many another famous man; and by her side her 'young husband,' with the massive head and the long white beard—a pair whom God truly joined together, and left to travel together far past the normal term of life, to be a picture of His fairest creation, human love made sacred by His 'smyle.' After all, like the old Greek hero, Cowell had 'his little old woman' and 'immortality' as well. 'To thy sone is given long blessedness, sure as I tell thee,' are, I find, the prophetic words with which close my notes of the last Avesta lecture I had from him. If he did not write the 'great book,' he lived the great life; and if, like most other writers of books, he was only to 'become peat,' it was a soil in which fairest flowers should grow. His learning has kindled a torch that many runners will carry on towards the distant goal; and his spirit will live again in lives made nobler for a presence which reflected with even radiance a gentleness and wisdom given from above.

THE ZOROASTRIAN CONCEPTION OF A FUTURE LIFE

The Parsis, the modern exponents of Zoroastrianism, are a small community, less than 100,000 in number, who are to-day mostly concentrated in Bombay and its neighbourhood. They found a refuge in India centuries ago, having been driven out of Persia, their own country, by the murderous hordes of invading Islam. The faith for which in Persia they had bravely endured a bloody persecution, to preserve which unsullied the faithful remnant of them were ready to leave their own land and go forth into the unknown, is almost as old as Judaism, and for loftiness and purity of doctrine towers high above all non-Christian religions with that same exception alone. It is, as its founder left it, absolutely monotheistic, free from any unworthy views of God, earnest and practical, and untainted by asceticism ; and if in later times it fell below its founder's too lofty ideals, and became corrupted with ritualistic puerilities and a worship of saints and angels which seriously compromises monotheism, it may be doubted whether it goes beyond the corruptions of Christianity in many of the more superstitious corners of modern Europe. The Parsis to-day are the most enlightened and progressive community among the natives of India, charitable and public-spirited, and free from all the ethical shortcomings which are chargeable upon Hinduism and Islam alike. They refuse to accept proselytes ; and they do but little to cultivate intensively a faith which in its primitive purity might be made a real power for the uplifting of its people. They tend to religious indifference, and a great many of them know but little of their own heritage. Under the stimulus of Western interest in and study of their ancient faith, they are improving in this respect; but secularism of practice is a conspicuous peril among them, as it is in the nominally Christian communities of the West.

So much of introduction seems demanded, but I pass from it with relief, inasmuch as I can here only speak at second hand: I have never been in India, and have studied the early history of this great religion to the practical exclusion of its later developments. Before I pass to the special heading of this paper, I must add a few words of summary to explain my presuppositions. I do not set these down as objective facts in all cases, for the evidence has been very differently read. The arguments by which I support my own reading have been set forth, first summarily in a little book in the 'Cambridge Manuals' series, *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*, and then with considerable elaboration in my Hibbert Lectures on *Early Zoroastrianism*. The latter work contains a translation of the primitive classics of Zoroastrianism, the Gâthâs or Hymns of Zarathushtra, together with a few Greek texts which contain valuable information for our purpose. To this book I may perhaps refer any who wish to know on what authority I make sundry statements which are necessarily dogmatic in form because of lack of time.

I shall keep to the original name of the prophet whom the Greeks and Romans called Zoroaster. Most people probably know the name Zarathushtra from the title of a notorious book by Nietzsche, who took this name in vain, as he took others that are holier. I need not inform you that Zarathushtra himself never sat for his portrait to Nietzsche, and that if you have read *Also sprach Zarathustra* you will find nothing in this paper to remind you of that rather fascinating but eminently mischievous book. The time of Zarathushtra's mission is much disputed. Parsi tradition dates him 660 to 583 B.C., but opinion seems to be strengthening in favour of an earlier time ; and we shall probably be not far out if we conceive of him as dating back to the tenth century or so. He was possibly a native of Media, but his prophetic activity was much further east ; and the seclusion of his labours in a region very far from the beaten tracks of ancient civilisation is the best explanation of the practical absence of reliable traces of his teaching till a much later date than sundry theorists have assumed. His Hymns (Gâthâs) are very scanty in extent and extremely difficult of interpretation, but we must refer every problem of Zoroastrianism proper to their arbitrament. For the bulk of the Avesta, of which the Gâthâs are much the oldest part, presents us with a most obvious declension from Zarathushtra's teaching in every particular. This deviation comes in two well-marked stages. First, after some short prose pieces in the archaic dialect of the Gâthâs, comes the mass of the verse Avesta, the *Yashts* and the later *Yasna.* Here we have, in metre and in thought and style, what is closer than anything in the Avesta to the kindred hymns of the Rigveda, though the Gâthâs are in a dialect much nearer to the Sanskrit. The religion presumed here is virtually Vedic. The old polytheism professed by the united people, who (perhaps about the middle of the second millennium) divided into Indian and Iranian, has returned, now that the mighty force of the prophet's personality has been withdrawn. During the fifth century (as I believe) a new force began to work with the coming of the Magi, a sacred tribe in Media, who had made a bold bid for political power during the reign of Cambyses, but were put down by the warrior Aryans under the great Darius. They seem to have set themselves to win spiritual power by way of compensation ; and in a couple of generations, perhaps, they had made themselves the indispensable priests of a religion very different from their own. They adapted to it their peculiar ritual and priestcraft, developed its theology along new lines, and completed the canon of the Avesta by adding prose books containing ritual, cosmogony, and other elements which we cannot identify, since so small a part of the original Avesta has come down to us.

I have thought it necessary to describe in brief the stratification of Avestan religion and religious documents, because without this basis I cannot discuss the relation of Zoroastrian eschatology to other eschatologies which interest us more closely. I proceed after this preface to take up the specific doctrine mentioned in the title of this paper.

With one very notable exception, all the characteristic and valuable elements in Zoroastrian eschatology come from Zarathushtra himself, and are to be derived from his own Hymns. There is no doubt that he worked up inherited material, developed into doctrine what had been mere mythology, tacitly ignored what did not fit into his highly abstract and spiritual system, and made much of every suggestion that carried possibilities of higher use. The recognition of this does not alter the claim of our great prophet to have been the creator of a majestic and highly ethical system whereby a future world should redress the uneven balance of the present world. I will reserve for a while my comments on the amazing fact that a Gentile prophet of so early a date should have soared so high into the mysteries and seen Truth so clearly.

I have said that Zarathushtra used traditional mythology. Not a few elements in the machinery of his doctrine of the Hereafter can be recognised as inherited myth, partly by parallels known from kindred systems, and partly by the patent fact that they are picturesque excrescences upon the system, never logically worked out, and only retained so far as they can be used to illustrate and enforce ideas wholly independent of them. The eschatology which Zarathusthtra inherited was almost entirely mythical in its basis. The religion of the Aryans—I use the word in its strict sense, of the tribes which divided into Iranians and Sanskrit-speaking Indians—was mostly a worship of nature powers ; and its Hereafter was built up of myths in which the daily miracle of the new-risen Daystar played a large part. Zarathushtra's basis was wholly ethical. The Problem of Evil was central in all his thought : it was forced upon him by personal experience, during his sufferings at the hands of brutal nomads who raided the cattle and took the lives of his peaceful agriculturists. His was the problem of the Seventy-third Psalm, the problem with which all Europe is wrestling in these days of war : Why is brute force allowed so often to triumph over justice ? Why is 'Right for ever on the scaffold, Wrong for ever on the throne' ? Those who fairly face that question must either sacrifice Theism—to which a good and a just God is essential—or take refuge in a Theodicy. Zarathushtra believed so firmly and passionately in God that he caught the vision of a world 'in which dwelleth Righteousness,' enthroned for evermore.

To understand Zarathushtra's Hereafter, therefore, we must understand his doctrine of Good and Evil. His name for God, which had been most naturally assumed to be of his own coining—it is remarkably characteristic of him—has now been proved centuries older than his time. *Ahura*, 'Lord,' the Vedic *Asura*, was still in the Gâthâs the title of spiritual beings, abstractions who are really part of the hypostasis of God. To this was added the attribute *Mazdâh*, 'Wise' ; and in Western Iran, upon the old Persian inscriptions of Darius and his successors, the combination is fused into one word, *Auramazda*, the *Ormazd* of later days and *Oromazdes* of the Greeks. The 'Wise Lord' was for Zarathushtra Creator of all things, beneficent, all-knowing. The massy heavens are His robe, and infinite space His dwelling. In the beginning we read :

'The two primeval Spirits, who revealed themselves in vision as Twins, are the Better and the Bad in thought and word and action. And between these two the wise once chose aright, the foolish not so.[1]

The two spirits are expressly called *Twins*, but the term is not developed: it was later Mazdeism that found a parent in 'Endless Time.' Nor are we told what was the relation of the 'Better Spirit' to Ahura Mazdâh. Strict logic should equate them; but whatever the later writings of Parsism may do, the Gâthâs never suggest any such equality between Ahura Mazdâh and the Evil Spirit as the name *Twins* suggests. Are we to say that the whole verse is a detached philosopheme about Good and Evil and how they are differentiated, the one the simple negation of the other, a yes and a no that are linked like twins? This would release us from the necessity of bringing Mazdâh into express relation with the statement which quite impersonally sets forth the genesis of evil. Such a consideration gains weight from the generally unobserved fact that Zarathushtra never *names* the Evil Spirit. A casual epithet, 'enemy,' is once applied to him, and this is taken up and turned into a proper name in the later Avesta, where *Angra Mainyu*, 'Enemy Spirit,' crystallises into one word, like *Auramazda*, and gives us the ultimate *Ahriman*, the Greek *Areimanios*. But as far as the Gâthâs go his name might have been *Aka Mainyu*, 'Bad Spirit,' for that does occur twice! In the Gâthâs Evil is far more often called *Druj*, 'Falsehood'; but there is less personification than we find in John Bunyan's thumbnail sketches of a virtue or a vice. Abstraction was of the essence of Zarathushtra's processes of thought.

In this paper I am not concerned with delineating Good and Evil in themselves, but with describing their present relation and future destiny. Parsism is generally credited with being 'dualistic.' If we confine the epithet to the system of the Magi, with its mechanically balanced antitheses of white and black, I have no objection. But in the Gâthâs I can see no more dualism than in the New Testament. Evil begins with the deliberate choice of a free agent, who thereby constitutes himself the enemy of the Good Spirit: he is the complete opposite of him in everything. I may quote the stanza where the epithet 'enemy' is used:

---

[1] *Yasna* 30^3. I quote the Gâthâs from my own version in my Hibbert Lectures.

> I will speak of the Spirits twain at the first beginning of the world, of whom the holier thus spake to the enemy: Neither thought nor teachings nor wills nor beliefs nor words nor deeds nor selves nor souls of us twain agree.[1]

The fight between the two Powers ranges over the whole field of thought, word, and action, and never ceases. But Zarathushtra never betrays an instant's questioning as to the result. He wistfully prays, in the hour of defeat and oppression, that he may have some token of God's favour in this life:

> Shall I indeed earn that reward, even ten mares with a stallion and a camel, which was promised unto me, O Mazdâh, as well as through thee the future gift of Salvation and Immortality? [2]

Over and over again we hear the ringing note of certainty as to the ultimate triumph of the good cause and the ruin of all who embrace the evil, however confidently they may shake their mailed fist here. There is no sort of equality between the two Powers. As a merely speculative point, we might have to admit that Mazdâh has his omnipotence limited during the present aeon. Zarathushtra might have answered Man Friday's question, 'Why God not kill debbil?' by saying that He *cannot*, till the hour comes. Christianity says rather that He *will* not, since Evil is not to be destroyed by force, but by love. Both agree in declaring that He will destroy it at the set time.

---

[1] *Yasna*, 45^2.

[2] *Yasna*, 44^{18}.

‘In vain doth Satan rage his hour’; if he does not know that he fights vainly, it is only because ignorance is one of his attributes, as the antithesis of the Wise Lord. This, however, is a touch characteristic of the Magian dualism, which is so much concerned to make the attributes of Ahriman exactly balance those of Ormazd, that it has to enfeeble the Evil Spirit lest he should usurp faculties of Ormazd. It is Magianism also which fixes an exact term for the strife. The conflict is a gigantic game of chess, with a black piece equal and opposite to every white one. And the formula is, as Mrs. Maunder excellently put it, ‘White to play, and mate in so many millennia.’ Zarathushtra is not interested in such precision. He takes Evil very seriously indeed, and finds it anything but an ‘ineffectual angel’ of darkness, to be rendered impotent by words of a Gâtha muttered as a spell, and by the killing of frogs and ants. The weapons of his warfare are prayer and pure thought, words of truth, and the simple husbandman’s industry. Nor does he think of millennia: he clings to the hope that the Kingdom of God is at hand, and he will see it. Zarathushtra accordingly began where the Apostles began ten centuries later. It is of the nature of enthusiasm to see a distant landscape very near and clear; and it is a condition of humanity, if it sees the future at all, to see it foreshortened, the far away mountain peak and the near hill melting into one outline. We have realised this specially in the recent keen discussion on the eschatology of the New Testament. But there is a suggestive contrast between the paths of the two religions when the flight of time dimmed the brightness of the Advent Hope. Zarathushtra left no successors who could catch up and wear his mantle. His followers called him Lord! Lord! and gave him worship which would have horrified him unspeakably; but they could not do the things he bade them, for these were too simple and too high for them. When the promise of the End was deferred, and all things continued as they were from the beginning of the Creation, the Magi devised an elaborate system of world-ages, which fix the Renovation for the year A.D. 2398. We need not laugh at them : they were wiser than some prophets of our own, many of whose dates for the End have come and gone already. But we may compare instructively the very different course taken by Christianity when 'the fathers fell asleep,' and still the Promise of the Advent was delayed. The very delay taught new lessons, and the Church took up new conceptions of work to be done. It was one example among many of the fact that Iran had but a single isolated prophet, while Israel and Christianity had a 'goodly fellowship' in bright succession.

It is time to describe more in detail the 'Great Consummation' as it revealed itself to Zarathushtra. The destiny of individuals comes later : it was indeed for him only an appendage of the universal event. As in the New Testament, but still more conspicuously, the Day comes with Fire. Fire is throughout the Parsi system the special symbol of God's holiness. Its particular form was that of a great flood of molten metal, let loose upon the universe. The righteous, as later fancy put it, would pass through the flood as through warm milk, but the wicked would be burnt up. The Evil Spirit and his hosts would be destroyed, and his realm purged. The figure is an example of the use of mythology, of which I spoke just now. The fire was an unmistakable survival from Aryan antiquity, and Zarathushtra's use of it is characteristically incomplete ; the machinery of individual judgment, as we shall see, is altogether inconsistent with it. But this figure and that alike illustrated the thought Zarathushtra meant to drive home ; and he cared little enough whether the figures were congruous with one other. What mattered for him was that men should be induced to fight manfully on the side of Asha, the Right, in confidence that the end of the campaign would be the eternal victory of God over evil of every kind.

The human agents of the Renovation are called *Saoshyantō*, ‘ they who will deliver ’ ; and Zarathushtra unmistakably means himself and his immediate helpers, King Vîshtâspa and the noble brothers Frashaoshtra and Jâmâspa. As I said just now, the consummation was expected within the prophet’s lifetime. When that generation passed away, the term had to change its meaning ; and the Saoshyants became a succession of three miraculously born sons of Zarathushtra, to appear at intervals of a thousand years, the last of whom was to usher in the End.

At this point we necessarily pass from the universal to the individual. What was to happen to the wicked when at last slow Vengeance overtook them ? There are, I suppose, just three possibilities which come within the range of our human thought—which is not equivalent to denying the possibility of a fourth, inconceivable to our faculties as a fourth dimension of space. They may be annihilated or reduced to unconsciousness at death, or at some time after death ; their punishment may end after an interval in restoration, or it may go on for ever. Among these there is no sign that Zarathushtra himself thought of any but the last. When later Parsi speculation pictured hell itself purified and added to the universal realm of Mazdâh, it may conceivably have built on lost Gâthâs. We are not obliged to demand consistency in this matter : the imagery used will quite naturally vary with the practical lesson which a prophet is urging at the moment. Even in the New Testament the upholders of each of the three doctrines—Conditional Immortality, Univeralism, Eternal Retribution—have been able to find texts which *prima facie* support their particular view. But in our extant Gâthâs Zarathushtra is perpetually insistent that the ‘ followers of the Lie ’ shall be to all time dwellers in the ‘ House of the Lie,’ tormented there eternally. It is hardly likely that it ever occurred to him to be tender towards those who not only refused his gospel, but savagely persecuted his converts. For him God is Righteousness and Truth, but His Fatherhood, hating nothing that He has made, lay below this great prophet's horizon. He was accordingly less perplexed than we with the problem of retribution: the enemies of humanity had earned their doom, and he can even take fierce delight in the contemplation of it. If later Parsi thought, under the impulse of Magian systematising, figured the Molten Metal as destroying hell, it was not tenderness towards Ahriman and his followers, but only a logical development of the requirement that the victory of Ormazd must be complete. The eschatology of the Pahlavi texts[1] is frankly universalist, except for the very worst sinners, who have turned themselves into demons and share the fate of Ahriman and his hosts. All this seems to be without warrant in the Gâthâs and is best interpreted as the outcome of Magian ideas.

We return to the Gâthâs to notice another conspicuous feature in the imagery of judgment. This is the 'Bridge of the Separator,' over which the dead have to pass. Originating probably in a primitive conception of the Milky Way as the path of souls, the idea was developed mythically; and Zarathushtra found it in possession as a bridge which shrank to a knife-edge width when the wicked essayed to cross, and expanded to a broad highway for the righteous. In this form it survived through later mythology, and was borrowed by Islam as Al-Sîrât's Arch. It spanned the abyss, into which the wicked fell. But we may be certain Zarathushtra never meant it to be a real test. The 'Separator,' whose office was closely attached to it, was a judge of conduct. Later doctrine probably kept up the spirit of the founder's idea when it pictured the righteous judges of souls occupied in weighing the merits and demerits of each soul before it traversed the Bridge, which thus becomes superfluous except as a picturesque and impressive emblem. It is at the Bridge that the remorse of the sinner is to come to a climax; but that is clearly because he stepped upon it as a newly-doomed man. Zarathushtra gives us no account of the actual happenings at the Bridge, nor does he stay to describe it. That may be simply because it was a familiar picture which he retained, not a critical conception of his own thought. Nor does he bring the Bridge into any relation with that other inherited emblem of the Molten Metal. We might conjecture that he thought of the latter as an ordeal, by which the Separator did his work. The Pahlavi theologians separated the two altogether, removing the Molten Metal to the future Renovation, when the damned will return from ages of penal suffering, to be finally cleansed by the burning flood. Zarathushtra in his Hymns is not compiling a treatise, and we must not press his silences too far. But it does not seem that we should solve the inconsistency in this way. The Bridge and the Metal are only imagery for him, and we need not drag them into system, any more than we should try to paint the imagery of our own Apocalypse of John.

---

[1] See it presented in Dhalla, *Zoroastrian Theology*, pp. 291 ff.

I may leave at this point the special doctrine of Retribution, and turn to the principles governing the Judgment as a whole. I referred just now in a sentence to the Weighing before the Bridge. This was an old Iranian idea. In Persian jurisprudence a culprit was always supposed to be judged on the balance of his whole record, being acquitted if his good deeds outweighed the bad. Since, moreover, the idea was ethical, we should expect to find Zarathushtra accepting it. In that case we should regard the 'Separator' as essentially a Judge of souls, like Minos, Aeacus, and Rhadamanthus in Greek mythology, whose work it is to divide the good from the bad. The Iranian tradition was ready with the names of the triad of angels who preside over the weighing. The chief of them was the Light-genius Mithra, who in the later Avesta takes a *rôle* which Zarathushtra himself might have warmly approved. But in the prophet's day

Mithra was the chief divinity of savage nomads who oppressed the settled agricultural population, and Zarathushtra will not acknowledge him: indeed, as I personally believe, he made him chief of the *Daevas*, the old Aryan nature-powers whom the reformer dethroned and made into demons. The 'Separator' before the Bridge was none other than Mazdâh. This appears from Zarathushtra's declaration to his chief lieutenant, Jâmâspa. In Paradise, he says:

> I shall recount your wrongs . . . before him who will *separate* the wise and the unwise through Righteousness (Asha), his prudent counsellor, even Mazdâh Ahura.[1]

That Mazdâh is to 'judge the world in righteousness' is what we should expect Zarathushtra to teach; nor is it less in keeping that he is himself to plead before the Judge, the advocate of his faithful followers, and accuser of those who wronged them. A vivid anthropomorphic figure pictures the Judge as pointing to each man his destiny:

> Of thy Fire, O Ahura, that is mighty through Righteousness, promised and powerful, we desire that it may be for the faithful man with manifested delight, but for the enemy with visible torment, according to the pointings of the hand.[2]

The Fire—that is, in this context, the Molten Metal—is to follow the sentence, as the first element in the execution of Mazdâh's decree. Or, as suggested above, it may be a figure describing the supreme test, independent of the Weighing, and associated with the 'pointings of the hand' as the declaration of its result.

There is one curious sequel of the Weighing which has been proved to go back to Zarathushtra himself. The soul was adjudged righteous or wicked according to the balance of merits and demerits in thought, word, and action. Pahlavi theology insisted very strongly on the nicety of the balance: the estimation of a hair—

---

[1] *Yasna*, 46^{17}.

[2] *Yasna*, 34^{4}.

to be more exact, an eyelash—was enough to determine the issue of heaven or hell. But what if the scales exactly balanced ? For this case a limbo was provided, called *Hamistakan*, in the later Avesta *misva gâtu*, ‘ the place of the mixed.’ Here, they said, in a place located between earth and the first heaven, souls would feel the alternations of cold and heat due to the seasons, until the Renovation brought their dubious position to an end. There are two stanzas in the Gâthâs which allude to this middle state, but without naming or defining it. The idea has been taken up in the Koran (Sur. 7), and (for once) decidedly improved upon. If we knew more of Zarathushtra's own system, we might be able to say that he had not only recognised the biggest of all problems of the Future, but even done something towards its solution. But if he did, posterity ignored his contribution. No one who knows Zarathushtra's sign-manual will find it on the Parsi Hamistakan.

One other dogma of later Parsism, partially rooted in the Gâthâs, must be named in connection with the Weighing of Merits. Zarathushtra taught that men can lay up treasure in heaven :

> And this, O Mazdâh, will I put in thy care within thy House—the good thought and the souls of the righteous, their worship, their piety and zeal, that thou mayst guard it, O thou of mighty dominion, with abiding power.

Upon this foundation the Pahlavi Rabbinists built the more dubious dogma of a treasure-house where were stored the supererogatory good works of the saints, for the benefit of those whose credit was inadequate. How this doctrine was squared with that of Limbo is not clear : the saints, as spiritual millionaires, might surely have spared of their superfluity enough to empty Hamistakan, when the weight of an eyelash was enough to do it for each one !

The deepest thought of Zarathushtra as to the future state is that each man's destiny is determined by his own self. Of the ‘future long age of misery, of darkness, ill food, and crying of woe!’ the prophet says:

> To such an existence, ye followers of the Lie, shall your own self bring you by your actions.[1]

And again:

> Their own soul and their own self shall torment them when they come where the Bridge of the Separater is, to all time dwellers in the House of the Lie.[2]

Zarathushtra called heaven sometimes ‘the Best Thought.’ He anticipated Marlowe and Milton in the truth which the Satan of *Paradise Lost* enunciates:

> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

The centrality of this doctrine in the Gâthâs enables us to put Zarathushtra's own seal on the most beautiful thing in the Avesta, the fragment on the passing of the righteous soul,[3] on which I wish there were time to linger. The climax of it comes when the soul, flying away to the South on the morning of the fourth day, meets a lovely damsel wafted towards him on a fragrant south wind:

> Then spake to her with question the soul of the righteous man: What maiden art thou, fairest in form of all maidens that ever I saw?
>
> Then to him replied she that was his own self: O youth of good thoughts, good words, good actions, good self, I am the self of thine own person.

She tells him that by worship and almsgiving he had made her ever fairer and more adorable. The fragment is imperfect when it comes to describe the passing of the wicked soul: it is, one fears, not probable that literary feeling forbade the author to spoil a gem! But Pahlavi books come to the rescue and tell us that the wicked soul, as it fled to the cold and demon-ridden North, was met by its own self as a hideous old hag. Every detail is duly reversed in the characteristic Magian way. But in both parts of the picture, if in the mechanically balanced strokes of the brush we recognise a Magian painter, the conception of the *Daenā* or Self as creator of destiny goes back to the genius of Zarathushtra.

---

[1] *Yasna*, 31^{21}.

[2] *Yasna*, 46^{11}.

[3] The *Hadhokht Nask*, generally known as *Yasht* 22. I have given a free verse paraphrase of this text at the end of my *Early Religious Poetry of Persia*.

The story of the destiny of the soul must be rounded off with a glimpse of the heaven into which the righteous enters: we began this survey with the hell wherein the wicked abides his punishment. The next stanza in the fragment just described tells us that the soul stepped successively into the Good Thought Paradise, the Good Word, the Good Deed, and finally to the Endless Lights. There Ahura Mazdâh bids them bring him 'spring butter,' the nectar and ambrosia of the Parsi heaven. This is all in the spirit of the Gâthâs, where heaven is variously called the House of Song, the Best Thought, the House of Good Thought, the Kingdom of Good Thought, the Best Existence, etc. And if only in antithesis to the description of the House of the Lie quoted above, we may picture Zarathushtra's House of Song to be a place 'of bliss, of light, of dainty food, and singing of joy.'

What then about the body? It is here that the great gulf fixed between Zarathushtra and the Magi is most apparent. Those who know nothing else about the modern Parsis know how they dispose of their dead. The corpse of a good man is the most unclean thing in the world: it represents the victory of the Death-fiend over a creature of Mazdâh. Hence it must never touch the sacred earth or waters, but be devoured by birds of prey. Herodotus tells us that here the Magi differed from the Persians, for the latter covered the corpse with wax and buried it. This answers both to the silence and the obscure speech of the Gâthâs. These have no hint that a corpse polluted the earth. On the contrary, we read that Aramaiti, the archangel of Piety, who presides over the earth, 'gave continued life of their bodies, and indestructibility.'[1] Earth, then, is so charged with life-giving potency that she will at last give a body to those who sleep in her bosom. There is nothing more to be got out of the Gâthâs here, but later Parsism develops very elaborately the stages of the final Resurrection, when the hitherto disembodied souls will receive new bodies and enter the life of the new world, all except those sinners who have made themselves into veritable fiends. There are many other features of later speculation which would repay mention, but my time has gone, and I must only deal briefly with one subject of special importance to us.

It is an obvious consequence of the facts and dates presented that Zarathushtra's was the earliest voice to preach an ethical doctrine of immortality, unless Egypt can make good a counter-claim. It is, moreover, a doctrine to which Christianity itself would not wish to offer any protest. We have much, very much, to add from the teaching of Him who brought life and immortality to light out of the mists of reverent intuition in which even a prophet's apocalypse left the great hope of mankind. But it is a very wonderful thing that one solitary Eastern thinker should have travelled so far at least six, and more probably ten, centuries before the day when all graves were opened by the emptying of one. We rather tend to break out with Joshua's exclamation, when jealous for the sake of Moses. We are so accustomed to think of Israel as on the mountain-top to catch the first rising of every new light in religion, that we can hardly understand how immortality should have been unthought of till the Old Testament canon was nearly closed. Nor is this all. There have been many scholars—not, however, among Zoroastrian specialists, but exclusively, I think, from the camp of Old Testament study—who have urged that contact with Zoroastrianism gave the first impulse to the doctrine in Israel. I have always been attracted by the idea, which gives a new wealth of meaning to the opening verses of Hebrews, and to that great phrase in which Paul tells us that the Christian Church is the heir of all the ages.[1] But more than twenty years' study of early Zoroastrianism has for me reduced near the vanishing point any possibility that the Jews in the Captivity could have come in contact with the pure teaching of Zarathushtra, which alone was lofty enough to contribute anything to Israel's spiritual riches. In Babylon and Media they could meet with Magi who appealed to Zarathushtra's name. But I cannot find that in that age the real teaching of the Gâthâs was well enough understood to stand out above the kind of doctrine which the priests taught. Archaic in language, extremely difficult and ambiguous even to modern scientific research, the Gâthâs were a sealed book, even for the men who faithfully transmitted their words as potent charms against the devil.

---

[1] *Yasna*, 30^{1}.

But the comparison of this great thinker's divinely guided intuitions suggests one final reflection. Zarathushtra threw himself upon God's justice, and thence deduced another world as the only answer to the question whether the Judge of all the earth must not do right. Those who came before him had deduced Immortality from God's power and the analogy of Nature. But even Zarathushtra's was not the highest way ; and all experience tells us that the way is even more important than the end when men set out in quest of Truth. Immortality had yet to be deduced from the Love of God, and the realising of that love was a far more important element in Israel's training than the very hope of heaven could be. So it was that when earthly power and glory had long vanished, and the oppressed people of God could no more even call the land of promise their own, the saints who wrote the later hymns in the Book of Psalms came to realise and teach that God Himself is more than enough to satisfy man's need, and that if He can be addressed by man as 'my God,' man cannot be left by Him to extinction in the grave.[1] Hence it is that Zarathushtra's sublime faith is to-day held, and held imperfectly, by a few myriads who will not accept a proselyte, while the faith of Israel prepared the first missionaries of a religion which claims to bring the ultimate truth to the whole world.

---

[1] 1 Cor. x. 11, 'Unto whom the tribute of the ages has come as our inheritance.' So I translate, on the lexical evidence of papyri and inscriptions of later Greek.

---

[1] May I refer to my Fernley Lecture, *Religions and Religion* (London, 1913), pp. 75-79, for an expansion of this argument ?

THE CHALLENGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY[1]

The *Golden Bough* is a book that not many men living would care to review under their own name, if they had anything above the meanest conception of what reviewing ought to be. Its amazing learning takes it at once out of the range of criticism by any but expert anthropologists, although its lucid style and clearness of thought may tempt the mere layman to imagine himself capable of weighing or even challenging its conclusions. After ten years' publicity in its original form, it reappeared at the end of 1900 in a second edition more than doubled in size, and has been more widely read than ever. It comes to us as one of the most important scientific works ever written in the university of Newton and Darwin and Adams, and as such demands the serious attention of all who mark the progress of thought.

The reader will not expect a review, after what has been already said, from an amateur such as the present writer admits himself to be. Nor is it possible to give here even an adequate table of contents for a book containing over fourteen hundred pages, which the slightest diffuseness would have made into a much bigger book still. The object of this article is to press once more on the attention of the Christian apologist the importance of a new challenge which he cannot possibly ignore, and which might easily be taken up in a spirit most disastrous for the future of the faith among thinking men of the next generation.[1]

---

[1] *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion.* By J. G. Frazer, D.C.L., Litt.D.

Magic and Religion. By Andrew Lang.

Anthropology and Christianity. By Alexander Macalister, M.D., F.R.S.

It will be necessary, before we turn to the momentous question here raised, to say a few words to explain the general character of this great work. The relation of the title to the subject makes one think of *The Ring and the Book*. Just as Browning tells a brief story and builds his four volumes of thought and song upon the several aspects of the simple tale, so Dr. Frazer tells in six vivid pages the weird old Roman use from which he starts, and then builds upon its sundry elements a series of theories which seek to probe the depths of man's religious history, each of them illustrated with a wealth of evidence drawn from the rights and superstitions and folk customs of civilised and uncivilised people in every age since history began. The story of his title is that of the grove at Aricia, seen in Turner's famous picture, where Diana's shrine was served by the 'King of the Wood,' the runaway slave who held his priesthood till another could slay him, after plucking from the tree the 'Golden Bough.' To explain this grim survival, Dr. Frazer develops the theory, which may thus be stated in a few words before we pass on to certain matters of great moment incidental to the proof. The oak-tree, which the 'ghastly priest' of Macaulay's 'Lake Regillus' had to guard, was the tree worshipped by Indo-Germanic (so-called 'Aryan') tribes from the days of their original unity. Its life was probably supposed to reside in a 'golden bough,' the mistletoe, which grew from it. The tree-spirit was conceived as incarnate in a man, whose physical powers must never be allowed to fail, lest the powers of the tree should fail with them. In the earliest times, therefore, the human representative of the divinity was slain after a brief period, and his functions transformed to another doomed man; but afterwards the milder custom arose of letting him live while he was strong enough to defend his title against all comers. Since the man represented the tree, the challenger must first pluck the bough in which the tree's life resided, and then slay the tree's incarnation if he could, to reign in his stead as

---

[1] From a notice in the March *Expository Times*, it appears that a book has just been published by the 'Rationalist Press' which attacks the supernatural basis of Christianity by popularising anthropological facts such as those to be described below. It will be seen that Dr. Frazer presents facts, but draws no conclusions in this matter. It seems obvious that we should not allow the rationalists the monopoly of such material.

> The priest who slew the slayer
> And shall himself be slain.

It is not our present purpose to discuss the validity of the thesis just sketched. Each step of it is defended by Dr. Frazer with an immense mass of evidence collected from all quarters of the world; and even were the explanation of the Arician cult to be sacrificed as unproven, the value of the book as a delineation of primitive superstitions would be very little affected. Mr. Andrew Lang demolishes the whole theory to his own satisfaction in a chapter of the new book whose title appears at the head of this article. Whether Mr. Lang is to be treated seriously as an anthropologist we must leave it to the anthropologists to say. He has translated Homer extremely well, and has easily slain the higher critics who for a century past have been wickedly disintegrating the poet into his constituent atoms. With equal ease he has vanquished the critics of the Society for Psychical Research. Now he brings into the arena the same keen debating power, the same smartness and brilliancy of style, and after a brush with Professor E. B. Tylor settles down to *combat à outrance* with Dr. Frazer. How far these incisive thrusts penetrate his antagonist's armour the experts must decide. But it is hardly necessary to warn theologians against too suddenly assuming that a Daniel has come to judgment in the person of this versatile and amusing writer. They welcomed many a now forgotten Daniel when the Origin of Species was a novelty. They still hold out their hands to some rather dubious Daniels who have their 'lines of defence of the biblical revelation,' which will certainly not be defended *tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.* It is earnestly to be hoped that the mistake will not be repeated now. The novelty of Dr. Frazer's position, and the hints he gives that he is not himself a believer in orthodox Christianity, may easily alarm reverent men. Our object in this article will be to show that the alarm is needless, that the faith has nothing to fear whichever school of anthropology wins the day, and that if the great majority of Dr. Frazer's propositions—expressed or suggested—ultimately hold the field, we have only a fresh evidence of the unity of revelation and a grander exhibition of the divine programme of human history.

Let us begin with the most important matter, and set forth the challenge of anthropology in a form which will at once raise the central issue. Suppose we state the creed of Christendom as a belief in a Son of God who was miraculously born into the world as Man, who was slain as man's atoning substitute, and rose again from the dead: let us add that He warned His followers of evil powers which strove unseen to seduce them from goodness, and that He instituted a memorial service in which they were to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood under the similitude of bread and wine. What are we prepared to reply when we find that *every one* of these cardinal points in our faith can be directly paralleled in the doctrines and practices of various heathen races, some of them mere savages? There are sundry courses open to us. We may whittle away the facts, denying here, explaining away there, pronouncing others to be mere superficial resemblances. In this kind of process Mr. Lang, if we read him fairly, would probably be an excellent guide. But it must be felt that this is a very insecure method of defending the faith: there must always be the uneasy consciousness that two hydra-heads are likely to grow in the place of the one which we have triumphantly clubbed. Assuming the facts, then, there are, according to the authorities, three stages of opinion upon them. We may go on the lines of the first missionaries to Mexico, who found a heathen eucharist among the ordinary rites of the country, and declared that the devil was parodying Christian verities. It is not necessary to argue against this view nowadays. Or we may believe that God ordained the course of development of heathen superstition, so that it might supply types and figures of the perfect revelation when it came. We cannot accept this view with any pleasure—least of all after reading the *Golden Bough*—for it makes God the deliberate author of a series of horrors and cruelties which haunt the reader's memory with a shudder. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum* is writ large all over the pages of this book, and it would go hard with our faith if we were forced to find here the work of a heavenly Father. Are we then shut up to the third course, which frankly eliminates the supernatural and makes St. Paul and the savage of Central Australia merely two ends of a great evolutionary process, brought about by 'natural' causes alone?

It seems to us that the leap from the second to the third of these attitudes of mind has been too violent, and that the truth lies somewhere between them. Let us review the realities of theology and natural science during the last half of the nineteenth century. We all remember how the great hypothesis of Darwin was first received—by the materialist as the charter of triumphant atheism, by the Christian theologian as a doctrine subversive of all religion. How do we stand now? Whether the hypothesis is right or wrong, it is sufficiently obvious that the hopes of materialism and the panic of theology were alike utterly unjustified, however natural they may have been. The materialist has found evolution helpless without *something outside* to give at least the first impulse to the wheels of cosmic processes. The theologian has found that evolution affects no more than the *method* of God's working, the *fact* of that working remaining untouched. God's works were not turned out like the products of a modern factory, a hundred at a time, and all exactly alike. The eye of an insect, the brain of a Shakespeare, equally took countless ages to develop ; and we have learnt to marvel at such a creative process as infinitely more wonderful than a separate creation could have been. Is there any ground, then, for alarm if it is suggested that the same principle may perhaps be recognised in the process by which God dowered man with His richest gift, the power of union with Himself ? What will the evolutionary hypothesis mean as applied to religion ? We start, of course, with the stupendous postulate, the presence in the universe of a living God. A *postulate* we call it, for necessarily it does not admit of proof by ordinary reasoning. But the materialist has only a blank of nescience in the place where we see God. Our 'postulate' explains the facts ; his blank explains nothing. It will be time enough to consider a purely naturalistic theory of the origin of religion when we have before us a companion theory of the origin of life, or of the primary impulse which started the evolution of worlds.

Putting aside then, as too wide a question for our present limits, the discussion of the evidences of degradation as a basal element in man's religious history, a subject acutely argued by Mr. Lang against Dr. Tylor in one of the papers of the above-named book—let us ask how analogy would lead us to expect that God would teach religion to savages like those now found in Australia in an age wherein He still suffered 'all the nations to walk in their own ways,' though not 'leaving Himself without witness.' Would it not be by laying hold of man's own childish ideas and causing them to develop under the action of laws laid deep in the very constitution of the race ? The fact that God works through law does not mean, either in physical or moral evolution, that He sets the process going and then leaves His work till the next impulse is needed, as a man first starts his watch and then winds it up when it is running down. By what means the germ of religion is thus divinely planted in the savage mind does not matter to our argument. Dreams, ghosts, reverence for dead ancestors, the ‘ despair of magic ’ which led men to conceive that where man has failed to influence the processes of nature there must be powers somewhere that can succeed [1]—any one of these channels may have served, and perhaps one in one place and another in another. St. Paul declares that ‘ rains and fruitful seasons ’ were sent from heaven expressly to witness for the Creator. Could such witness by itself enable the savage to leap to the heights of a pure monotheism ? Surely he would first infer from what he saw that the heaven which sent the rain and the tree which produced the fruit were themselves divine. Linguistic science has proved that this very faith, the cult of the Sky and the Oak, was the religion of the dwellers in the primeval forests of mid-Europe, ancestors alike of the Brahmin and the German, the Greek to whom St. Paul pleaded from his own poets, and the Roman whose civilisation paved the way for the Gospel. Such a religion is very far indeed below the faith of a Socrates, but that does not prevent our believing that the fair flower grew by natural development out of the shapeless germ, under the sunlight of the All-Father's presence. Nor is the religious development of Israel itself essentially different in spite of the uniqueness which on any conceivable theory must mark it from first to last. The gradual development of doctrine throughout the period of the Old Testament is a commonplace of all modern scholarship. The men whose teaching lifted Israel to so great height above the nations were inspired of God indeed, but they were not sent with a lesson too hard for the people to take in. ‘ When Israel was a child,' he was taught as a child, and his religious training progressed as education always does. The teacher who took his children to Aristotle before the alphabet would not be certificated as efficient; and the fact that Israel's teacher was divine does not set aside the necessary rule of 'line upon line, precept upon precept; here a little and there a little.'

---

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii. p. 458 ff.

And how will the same principle show itself in the crowning act of divine revelation? There were an infinite number of possible ways in which God might have manifested Himself among men and purged them of their sin. We may be antecedently certain that the way which was chosen was chosen because, man being what he is, there was no other way possible. The plan of the Incarnation and the Atonement grew necessarily out of human needs and human nature; and out of that same nature of man grew also the beliefs and ideas which prepared the way for the plan of redemption. All the world over men have told stories of marvellous births, whereby a child of more than human power has been born of a mortal mother by a father who is divine. It matters not what the origin of such stories may be. The fable prepared the way for the fact, and helped men to take it in. Even more abundantly true is this of the Atonement. That the idea of incarnations of a divinity is common everywhere among men we have long known. It is the distinguishing feature of the *Golden Bough* that it brings before us a vast number of incarnations of a kind we have hardly known before. In nearly all cases the man-god is doomed, by the very fact of his assumed divinity, to die for the good of men; and if the sacrifice is not actually carried out, there are clear traces in the ritual of a time when it was. The victim either takes to himself the ills of others, or he gives his body to be devoured by worshippers who believe that divine qualities thus flow into themselves; sometimes the idea of the sacramental food and that of the scapegoat are combined. It is not easy to master the repulsion which comes over us when we bring a revolting cannibalism thus into connection with the sacred parable of the Lord's Supper. But did not our Lord Himself deliberately shock the Jews in this very way, in order to force on them the vital truth that man has no life in himself save by taking into his deepest self the very life of the Divine Man? And when we are able to look at the anthropological facts thus, we find that they supply us with a most valuable hint as to the profound connection of the Atonement with the very elements of human nature. Few features of that great doctrine are more striking than the extent to which it is 'hid from the wise and understanding, and revealed unto babes.' The little child takes it in easily: it is only when his intellect has thoroughly developed that difficulties suggest themselves. The simple savage in every part of the world drinks in the evangel with delight, and were the missionary to describe to him its problems he would be utterly perplexed. Meanwhile the acute and highly trained theologian can rarely frame a theory of his gospel which will fully satisfy himself, and still more rarely one which will satisfy other thinkers. It is a strange paradox indeed, this 'foolish thing of God' which is 'wiser than men.' Are we not helped towards understanding by the new evidence which shows how the *fact* of the Atonement corresponds with a primitive instinct of humanity, so that by satisfying that instinct it wins at once the hearts of all that feel their need?

We may leave to the reader to supply the precisely similar argument for the complementary doctrine of the Resurrection. Neither in this nor in the other case must we expect to satisfy those who cannot believe in the Christian faith. They will insist on using the anthropological evidence to discredit the supernatural in Christianity. Be it so. Only let us point out that the sole difference between our position and theirs lies in our accepting the postulate of theism. Once granted the presence of God in the world, our view of the facts proposes no difficulty which the most rigidly scientific could stumble at. On the reasonableness of such a postulate, as the only doctrine yet propounded which can pretend to explain the facts, we have already spoken. It seems to us, therefore, that Christians are on absolutely unassailable ground when they refuse to lay down any *a priori* objections to the evolutionary account of human development, leaving the question to be settled without prejudice by inquiries which the 'orthodox' and the sceptic can prosecute together.

We must defer to another article the statement of a number of very interesting examples of the anthropological method in dealing with details of biblical lore, as well as some not less interesting evidence showing up the true origin and history of the superstitions which infect the Roman—and, alas! other 'Catholic'—branches of Christianity. There is one section, however, of this great work which must be taken up at this point, as closely connected with the subject we have been discussing. It may be safely assumed that the attitude of very many Christians towards the *Golden Bough* will be determined by the long passage in the third volume which develops Dr. Frazer's theory of the Crucifixion. The section is, perhaps, the most notable novelty of the second edition, and it has naturally been fastened upon to an extent which has probably made many people greatly over-estimate its importance in the scheme of the book. Mr. Lang is largely responsible for the sensation that has been got up on the subject. He has opened fire on Dr. Frazer's theory in about half a dozen newspapers and reviews, and he gathers together the essence of his criticism in *Magic and Religion*, where this one subject accounts for no less than one hundred and thirty-six pages out of three hundred and five. Moreover, the impression has been created that Dr. Frazer has been deliberately wounding Christian feeling by a repulsive theory as to the death of the

Lord Jesus. As a matter of fact, such an impression is the very reverse of the truth. Were the theory, as a whole, conclusively proved, it would have no effect but to enhance our adoring wonder at the Saviour's self-abasement.

There are two details relating to the triumphant entry and the purging of the temple,[1] which we could not accept without admitting that our evangelists had seriously misreported the events they describe. All the rest of the theory might have been propounded by the soundest of divines without risking any severer criticism than that the Gospels might have been expected not to ignore so telling a feature in the Passion story. Put very briefly, the theory amounts to this. During the Exile the Jews borrowed from the Persians the Feast of Purim, which is traced back to a Babylonian feast called the Sacæa :—

> It was customary, we may suppose, with the Jews at Purim, or perhaps occasionally at Passover, to employ two prisoners to act the parts respectively of Haman and Mordecai in the passion play which formed a central feature of the festival. Both men paraded for a short time in the insignia of royalty, but their fates were different ; for while at the end of the performance the one who played Haman was hanged or crucified, the one who personated Mordecai and bore in popular parlance the title of Barabbas, was allowed to go free. Pilate, perceiving the trumpery nature of the charges brought against Jesus, tried to persuade the Jews to let Him play the part of Barabbas, which would have saved His life ; but the merciful attempt failed, and Jesus perished on the Cross in the character of Haman.

'In the character of Haman'! Could the words of the prophet, 'He was numbered with the transgressors,' receive a more impressive emphasis than such an idea as this ? Strange that any Christian sentiment should have been shocked by a theory the proof of which would so powerfully illustrate the central thought of the Atonement, the Redeemer's mysterious identification with sin. Dr. Frazer calls attention to one or two incidental advantages of the theory, including the fact that it interprets the release of one prisoner at the feast. He then concludes with an eloquent and suggestive passage which we must quote, premising that the distant original of the Haman of this annual celebration has been traced back in the theory to an incarnation of the spirit of vegetation, seen in so well known a figure as Tammuz, and extremely common in Western Asia, which accordingly becomes a soil well prepared for the new doctrine of Christianity :—

---

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii. p. 194.

> A chain of causes which, because we cannot follow them, might in the loose language of daily life be called an accident determined that the part of the dying god in this annual play should be thrust upon Jesus of Nazareth, whom the enemies He had made in high places by His outspoken strictures were resolved to put out of the way. They succeeded in ridding themselves of the popular and troublesome preacher ; but the very step by which they fancied they had simultaneously stamped out His revolutionary doctrines contributed more than anything else they could have done to scatter them broadcast, not only over Judæa, but over Asia ; for it impressed upon what had been hitherto mainly an ethical mission the character of a divine revelation, culminating in the passion and death of the incarnate Son of a heavenly Father. In this form the story of the life and death of Jesus exerted an influence which it could never have had if the great teacher had died the death of a vulgar malefactor. It shed around the Cross on Calvary a halo of divinity which multitudes saw and worshipped afar off ; the blow struck on Golgotha set a thousand expectant strings vibrating in unison wherever men had heard the old, old story of the dying and risen God. Every year, as another spring bloomed, and another autumn faded across the earth, the field had been ploughed and sown and borne fruit of its kind, till it received that seed which was destined to spring up and overshadow the world. In the great army of martyrs, who in many ages and in many lands, not in Asia only, have died a cruel death in the character of gods, the devout Christian will doubtless discern types and forerunners of the coming Saviour—stars

that heralded in the morning sky the advent of the Sun of Righteousness—earthen vessels wherein it pleased the divine wisdom to set before hungering souls the bread of heaven. The sceptic, on the other hand, with equal confidence, will reduce Jesus of Nazareth to the level of a multitude of other victims of a barbarous superstition, and will see in Him no more than a moral teacher, whom the fortunate accident of His execution invested with the crown, not merely of a martyr, but of a god. The divergence between these views is wide and deep. Which of them is the truer and will in the end prevail? Time will decide the question of prevalence, if not of truth. Yet we would fain believe that in this, and in all things the old maxim will hold good —*Magna est veritas et praevalebit.*[1]

The great advantage of letting Dr. Frazer sum up in his own words curtails the space available for discussing his startling hypothesis. We have said enough to show that there is very little indeed in it against which the devout Christian has any adequate motive to rebel. Whether it has evidence enough to be treated as probable—in the absence of direct testimony it must of course remain a hypothesis at best—is another matter. Dr. Frazer himself only brings it forward with hesitation, and the gaps in the evidence are admittedly serious, while the testimony there is shows not a few perplexing discords. The arguments in its favour being conceded, it still remains obvious *ex hypothesi* that countless Hamans had similarly perished without any suggestion of their rising again or any wish to regard them as divine. That the spread of Christianity should have been assisted by this association, if proved, would not in the very least diminish the truth of the assertion that Christianity spread because of the personality of its Founder. Those who would examine Dr. Frazer's Haman theory may see arguments both good and bad alike, enumerated categorically by Mr. Lang on page 202 of his book: we may assume that the author himself will not be long in reinforcing his case. Meanwhile, *non nostrum tantas componere lites*. It is enough to have shown that we have no *a priori* reason to object to the hypothesis, in which the ' devout Christian,' evolutionist though he be, has manifestly good and sound reason for discerning just what Dr. Frazer eloquently describes for him. And claiming as he does to follow One who is the Truth incarnate, he will not shrink for one moment from the issue. For, verily, ' truth is great, and shall prevail.'

---

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii. pp. 197, 198.

THE 'GOLDEN BOUGH'[1]

THE recent output of the famous author of the *Golden Bough* has been fairly bewildering in quantity and quality alike. The great work with which Dr. Frazer's name will always be associated appeared in its second edition, greatly enlarged, in 1900. Within the last four years four out of the six projected parts of the third edition have arrived, and the half is already much more than the whole, for there are over two thousand pages now, as against some fourteen hundred in the second edition. The mere penmanship and proof-correcting of such a book would have been a guarantee of industry. But within the period of this great enterprise there has been another work more extensive still. The four volumes on *Totemism and Exogamy* contain nearly two thousand two hundred pages, of which only the odd two hundred are accounted for as reprints of earlier work. All this is far from exhausting the publications of the great anthropologist during the decade since the *Golden Bough* reappeared in its second edition. We have selected two smaller works for their special interest in the list given above. A mere glance at the pages of these stately volumes will impress the most casual reader with the stupendous industry that underlies them. To those who have been behind the scenes, those masses of detailed references call up long lines of scrupulously neat manuscript books, minutely indexed, in which Dr. Frazer has transcribed extracts from endless treatises and journals, books of travel, missionary periodicals, scientific works on anthropology, *et hoc genus omne.* Faster than a moderately busy man can read them, these marvellous volumes flow from the press, the immense mass of facts and observations sorted out, recorded under their proper headings, indexed and referenced for every student to examine independently ; and those who know most of the writer and his methods wonder most how on earth it is done.

---

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy.* By J. G. Frazer, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Professor of Social Anthropology in Liverpool University, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Four vols. Macmillan, 1910.

The Magic Art, and the Evolution of Kings. (The first part of the third edition of the *Golden Bough.*) Two vols. Macmillan, 1911.

Taboo, and the Perils of the Soul. (Part II. of the same.) Macmillan, 1911.

The Dying God. (Part III. of the same.) Macmillan, 1911.

Adonis, Attis, Osiris. Studies in Oriental Religion. (Part IV. of the same.) Second edition. Macmillan, 1907.

Passages of the Bible, chosen for their Literary Beauty and Interest. Second edition. A. and C. Black, 1909.

Psyche's Task. A discourse concerning the Influence of Superstition on the Growth of Institutions. Macmillan, 1909.

But it need not be observed that with Dr. Frazer genius is a good deal more than an infinite capacity for taking pains. He has been not only the foremost collector and systematiser of facts in the young science which he has done so much to force to the front : he takes his place with the great pioneers who strike out far-reaching generalisations which, even if they are destined ultimately to yield their place or suffer material change, yet remain the indispensable means of scientific advance. There is a wonderful play of imagination in the very conception of the *Golden Bough.* In a paper in this *Review*, published nearly ten years ago, the present writer compared it with *The Ring and the Book* in regard of the extraordinary expansion which has made a slight-seeming story supply material for a work of immense extent. Such comments are of course still more pointed now. In two decades the famous treatise has twice doubled its size, and yet the unity is as clear as ever, and padding and irrelevance as rigidly excluded. The constructive fancy of the man of letters, as well as the precise logic of the scientist, are alike involved in the insight which in one strange ritual survival of ancient Italy can recognise a whole series of clues that lead the inquirer far away down the avenues of Time, into usages which on many sides of his nature reveal the very elements of the constitution of man.

The audience which Dr. Frazer now reaches is amazingly large for work of such high scientific quality. *Adonis*, *Attis*, *Osiris*, the first part of the new edition to make its appearance, within a little more than a year ran out of print, and came out afresh, greatly expanded in the process, after Dr. Frazer's manner, before the author could be allowed to press on with the rest of the book. When Part I. was published, early in the present year, its two bulky volumes, at twenty shillings net, sold to the extent of a thousand copies in the first week; nor did Part II. a few weeks later meet a less eager public. The beauty and lucidity of the style has no doubt much to do with the popularity of a work so crowded with exact learning and profound speculation. Characteristically enough, Dr. Frazer has always made a point of reserving time in which to saturate himself in the best English prose, in order to secure for his own English the qualities that his fastidious taste demands. Whether nature or industry, or the happy combination of the two, bestowed on him the gift, no reader will overlook the exquisite literary skill with which dullness and monotony are banished even from long sections devoted to the presentation of masses of closely similar social facts. And when the subject gives the artist his opportunity, the recounting of some romantic legend, or the setting forth of massive theory or comprehensive generalisation, the prose glows with warmth and energy: sonorous but natural cadences, lucid and unforced, with never a suggestion of mere fine writing or meretricious ornament, are lit with flashes of mordant irony or varied with touches of vivid word-painting. In particular we might well single out Dr. Frazer's prefaces [1] as samples of the very best style that our great language can command, the perfect use of words to express serious thought, in phrases that linger in the memory like strains of music. Thinkers and men of science will no doubt always be divided into the literary and the unliterary, the camp of Plato and the camp of Aristotle. We can gratefully recognise the service that a pioneer renders when he so emphatically follows the former ideal.

Any attempt to review even the broad lines of Dr. Frazer's latest treatment of his familiar theme would obviously break down on the space limitation that makes exposition impossible. The expansion which has so transformed the *Golden Bough* in its third edition consists, of course, very largely in the incorporation of new evidence, with discussion of points of detail involved therein. But the new form of the book is intended to remind us that the author no longer ties himself so closely to the original motive, the exposition and illustration of the ritual of Nemi. The hints provided there are followed out in various directions, which often lead away from the starting-point. Thus in the first volume of *The Magic Art* we now find Dr. Frazer's well-known thesis as to the relation of magic to religion expanded into a whole chapter, instead of being given briefly in strict relation to the special theme. The part of magic in the evolution of kingship is also investigated with great fullness. It is when we have thus studied the history of the institution of royalty that we come back to the grove of Aricia and understand what was signified by the dignity of the unhappy ex-slave who reigned as 'King of the Wood' until a stronger than he should pluck the 'golden bough' from the sacred tree, slay the royal priest, and wear his uneasy crown. This serves the minor purpose of linking the discussion with the title of the whole work;

---

[1] That to *The Dying God*, published too late for quotation here, is perhaps the gem of the whole series.

but it need not be added that the by-products of this process are of far greater importance than the object supposed to be in view. The historian is perpetually concerned with the person whom the accident of birth or fortune, or (less frequently) his own gifts of body or mind, have brought to rule his fellow men. How did this kingship arise ? What led men in the dim prehistoric past to tolerate and even welcome a social institution which gave such tremendous rights to the one as against the many ? We learn here that kingship began with duties rather than rights. The king held a position involving a minimum of personal comfort, and of brief tenure, dependent at best upon his continuing to preserve his fullest bodily powers intact. He was there simply to serve his people as a rainmaker, or by other magical arts believed to be inherent in his divine personality. And at the end there loomed before him the day when a sacrificial death, generally of barbarous cruelty, would crown his service and transmit his royalty to another wearer of his dignity. An Englishman takes satisfaction in noting that our own monarchy has developed away from the perversion which made the people the servants of the king, into the loftier ideal by which the king is the servant of his people. And the student of the New Testament observes how strikingly this primitive conception foreshadows the law of the kingdom of God—thus shown to lie along the lines of man's ultimate nature—that service is the one condition of precedence, and that the King of Men 'came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life as a ransom for many.'

We should like to tarry on the fascinating subject of Tree-worship, which occupies most of the second volume of Part I. It is full of interest for the reader of the Old Testament, who remembers the stern fight against the worship of the Asherah ; and again for the antiquary interested in old English customs, who goes to Knutsford on May Day to see the artificial survival of the Maypole, which meant so much in our distant forefathers' lives. But we must hasten on. The last instalment but one of the *Golden Bough* concerns the big subject of taboo, which is kept in close relation with the primitive conception of the Soul. The treatise of over four hundred pages is expanded from what in the first edition was only a single chapter. But in a striking preface Dr. Frazer indicates a line of extreme interest and importance which he has been obliged to touch only in passing, 'the part which these superstitions [about taboo] have played in shaping the moral ideas and directing the moral practice of mankind, a profound subject fraught perhaps with momentous issues for the time when men shall seriously set themselves to revise their ethical code in the light of its origin.' The remark leads the author on to comment in two weighty and eloquent pages on the 'perpetual flux' to which the moral world is subject no less than the physical.

> If we speak of the moral law as immutable and eternal, it can only be in the relative or figurative sense in which we apply the same words to the outlines of the great mountains, by comparison with the short-lived generations of men. The mountains, too, are passing away, though we do not see it; nothing is stable and abiding under or above the sun. We can as little arrest the process of moral evolution as we can stay the sweep of the tides or the courses of the stars.

Dr. Frazer's own answer to his question may be inferred best from the little volume of lectures entitled *Psyche's Task*, dedicated 'to all who are engaged in Psyche's task of sorting out the seeds of good from the seeds of evil.' There he shows how superstition acted as foster-mother to all the most important social institutions of mankind, viz., government, private property, marriage, and respect for human life. As he says in his preface :—

> If it should turn out that these institutions have sometimes been built on rotten foundations, it would be rash to

conclude that they must all come down. Man is a very curious animal, and the more we know of his habits the more curious does he appear. He may be the most rational of the beasts, but certainly he is the most absurd. Even the saturnine wit of Swift, unaided by a knowledge of savages, fell far short of the reality in his attempt to set human folly in a strong light. Yet the odd thing is that in spite, or perhaps by virtue, of his absurdities, man moves steadily upwards; the more we learn of his past history the more groundless does the old theory of his degeneracy prove to be. From false premisses he often arrives at sound conclusions: from a chimerical theory he deduces a salutary practice. This discourse will have served a useful purpose if it illustrates a few of the ways in which folly mysteriously deviates into wisdom, and good comes out of evil.

The optimist view of human development is thus powerfully proclaimed by the savant who has done more than any other writer to show us the horrors through which man has climbed, and is still climbing, to the future glory destined for him. To the relation of all this to religion we shall recur presently: at present it is enough to say that the picture thus painted by science is in complete harmony with the Christian doctrine that the goal of ethical perfection has been already revealed once for all in the 'Imperial Law' by which Jesus of Nazareth made ethics and religion one.

We must hasten away from the Taboo volume, which (if comparisons are to be made) contains perhaps a larger quantity of general interest than any of the sections. *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* has been before the public now for five years. It attaches itself to the *Golden Bough* by the fact that it forms part—only part—of the exposition of the royal sacrifice, by which the divine king is doomed, like the priest at Nemi, sooner or later to die. These three very similar Oriental cults are part of the field traversed in Part III. (just issued) on *The Dying God*. The cults are extremely interesting in themselves, and their local proximity to Palestine gives them special importance for the student of Hebrew religion. The volumes yet to come will all be more or less closely concerned with the subject of Part III. Part V., at present announced under the title *The Man of Sorrows*, will apparently contain Dr. Frazer’s revised exposition of his famous theory about the outward conditions of the Passion. I need not repeat here what I wrote in this *Review* in 1902, but will only say that I hold entirely to my assurance that the devout and intelligent Christian will find nothing to shock him, and much even to heighten his conception of the meaning of our Master’s humiliation. The concluding part, *Balder the Beautiful*, takes us to our ancestral Teutonic mythology for a ‘dying god’ of a special kind; and we may expect also the discussion of the ‘Golden Bough’ itself, since it was by an arrow of mistletoe that Balder met his fate. The forecast, drawn simply from the second edition, will serve to remind readers that Dr. Frazer may very possibly have kept the best to the last, and in any case has in store for us the very discussions to which Christian theologians will most eagerly turn.

With *Totemism and Exogamy* we pass to an entirely different field of anthropology: how distant is well seen by the fact that totemism does not figure at all in the index to Parts II. and IV. of the *Golden Bough*, and affects only a few pages in Parts I. and III. There is something fairly overpowering about these immense volumes, three of them occupied almost entirely with a survey of the evidence for the ethnographical distribution of the institutions in question. We open first upon the reprint, only eighty-seven pages long, of the little pioneer treatise with which Dr. Frazer helped to bring totemism into prominence twenty-five years ago. The notes and corrections in the fourth volume show that there is relatively little to blot, even when the discoveries among the Australian aborigines have made the subject take a new form in so many directions. Dr. Frazer reprints articles of his, twelve years old, in which he showed the significance of these discoveries: like the first essay, these are brought up to date by the notes in vol. iv. The coast is then clear for the description of the institutions of races which are affected by totemism with or without exogamy, institutions 'fundamentally distinct in origin and nature,' though brought together by circumstances. We must ignore the survey here, crammed though it is with profoundly interesting facts of savage life over a large part of the globe. The fourth volume contains the summing up and verdict upon a mass of facts unexampled in its fullness and scientific exactness. On totemism the most conspicuous result is the narrowing of its area. Writers on Greek and Hebrew religion have often discovered signs of totemism among the rudimentary forms which research uncovers. Dr. Frazer is profoundly sceptical.

> It is true that learned and able writers have sought to prove the former existence of totemism both among the Semites and among the Aryans, notably among the ancient Greeks and Celts; but so far as I have studied the evidence adduced to support these conclusions I have to confess that it leaves me doubtful or unconvinced (iv. 12 *et seq.*).

Historians of Hebrew religion will note the bearing of this on Robertson Smith's famous theory of the 'totem sacrament,' which takes a prominent place in attempts to interpret sacrifice as an institution. Dr. Frazer's remarks on the theory, as affected by Spencer and Gillen's Australian discoveries, will be seen on pp. 230 ff. of this volume. The evidence limits totemism to 'the dark-complexioned and least civilised races of mankind who are spread over the Tropics and the Southern Hemisphere, but have also overflowed into North America.' It appears to have arisen independently in different regions, under the impulse of similar conditions acting upon a mind essentially similar everywhere, but dying out in prehistoric times wherever free communication between progressive races cleared away the 'clogs on the advance of civilisation.'

With the quotation of Dr. Frazer's definition of totemism, and a reference to his theory of its origin, we must leave this part of our subject.

If now, reviewing all the facts, we attempt to frame a general definition of totemism, we may perhaps say that totemism is an intimate relation which is supposed to exist between a group of kindred people on the one side and a species of natural or artificial objects on the other side, which objects are called the totems of the human group. To this general definition, which probably applies to all purely totemic peoples, it should be added that the species of things which constitutes a totem is far oftener natural than artificial, and that amongst the natural species which are reckoned totems the great majority are either animals or plants (iv. 3 *et seq.*).

The extreme complexity of the investigation into the origins of this 'crude superstition' is well shown by the frank exposition of two theories which Dr. Frazer has held, the reasons which led him to abandon them, and the new theory to which further thought has now brought him. Put briefly, this theory depends on the savage's total ignorance as to the mystery of birth, the very connection of which with paternity is unknown to Australian aborigines of to-day. Maternal fancies, identifying the unborn child with some external object which struck a woman's notice when she first knew herself a mother, are taken to be 'the root of totemism.'

The allied though distinct subject of exogamy raises many questions that go deep into the problem of man's origin and development. Dr. Frazer sets forth with great fullness of detail the extraordinary system by which the lowest known savages, the Australian aborigines, guard against marriage within prohibited degrees, including in some tribes a relationship as distant as that of the first cousin. The why and whence of this universal[1] instinct against marriage within the kin is still among the unsolved problems of science. Dr. Frazer allows the probability that 'the starting-point of the present Australian marriage system' was 'sexual promiscuity, or something like it,'[2] whether or no this represents 'the absolutely primitive relations of the sexes among mankind': these he holds we can never hope to determine with any degree of assurance, since even the Australian has advanced immensely from earlier conditions. But whence came this 'growing aversion to the marriage of near kin'? Dr. Frazer shows that it cannot have been because primitive man found such interbreeding productive of degeneracy, for the very fact is uncertain and in any case hard to detect. He criticises severely Dr. Westermarck's attempted solution of the problem, showing (iv. 98) that he has tried to 'extend Darwin's methods to subjects which only partially admit of such treatment,' by omitting to 'take into account the factors of intelligence, deliberation, and will.' (The caution is one which some men of science need greatly, and we may hope they will accept it from one of themselves, though they will not from theologians!) The instinct cannot be due to the feeling that the breaking of the taboo will injure the offending parties, for the punishment is always on a scale which shows that the community is believed to suffer from the incest. Dr. Frazer thinks there may have been a primitive belief that incest produced injurious, and in particular sterilising, effects upon the whole people: one recalls the tremendous description of the curse following the unconscious crime of Oedipus, in the great drama of Sophocles. But he frankly confesses he has no evidence for this; and indeed if he had, we should only be explaining *ignotum per ignotius*. But the next pages are given to showing that the balance of expert opinion is in favour of the view that ‘the practice of exogamy or outbreeding would help,’ as its opposite hinders, ‘any community which adopted it in the long series of contests which result in the survival of the fittest.’ We have then an instinct, practically universal among men, the origin of which is entirely beyond our power to explain, justifying itself by producing results of importance to the race. Are we not face to face with a modernised form of the argument from design? That a blind and unintelligent series of mechanical forces contrived to implant these instincts, warning against things that were destined in the long run to produce physical harm to descendants, is a thesis some of us may be forgiven for regarding as more wonderful than any miracle.

---

[1] The rare exceptions only prove the rule.

[2] He is careful to state (iv. 138) that there is no *evidence* that this ever existed.

Let me close with a few words about the relation of Dr. Frazer's work to Christian apologetics, a subject which has indeed been very near the surface all through the present paper. A sentence from a *Times* review may be cited as focusing in short compass what many have said on the subject:—

> The verdict of posterity will probably be that the *Golden Bough* has influenced the attitude of the human mind towards supernatural beliefs and symbolical rituals more profoundly than any other books published in the nineteenth century, except those of Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

Prosit omen! Our theological stocktaking has at least got far enough for us to be able to count up our gains from the new spirit which Charles Darwin brought into human thought. (Herbert Spencer's name is incomparably less important, and we need not inquire how far his influence is permanent for good or evil.) If Dr. Frazer's work is to produce the same far-reaching effect upon theology that *The Origin of Species* has left after fifty years, it is not Christian thinkers who will have cause to lament. If I may be pardoned the personal note, speaking as one who for ten years has been profoundly influenced in all his thinking by Dr. Frazer's books, and yet more by intimate friendship with their author, I can very confidently express the assurance that religion only stands to gain when we recognise evolution as a mode of the Creator's self-revelation to men. Everywhere in the study of comparative religion we see how the deepest thoughts of Christian truth are shown to be in harmony with the very nature of man. It is not mere accident that in absolute independence, all over the world, primitive men should have conceived of the entrance of the divine into human life, and the death of the divinity, undergone that men might absorb his essence into themselves. The forms under which these ideas took shape have been grotesque enough, and often involve terrible cruelty. But the argument of *Psyche's Task* may be fairly applied here. Foolish or cruel, or both, have been the religious sanctions under which social institutions of unquestioned value have grown to maturity. We should call the games of children foolish if we judged them by the standard of grown men; nor is there wanting the analogue to the savage's unthinking cruelty. But we never confuse the childlike, which is natural, with the childish, which merits our contempt. And the childlike, in children and in savages alike, may be recognised as the inevitable stage of development which prepares for the day when maturity puts away the toys of the child as useful things outworn. We may certainly plead that if foolish and cruel taboos served a good purpose when they produced and preserved respect for the institution of private property, we need not cavil at the ways by which men learnt, line upon line, the great lessons of religion, to find at last in the life and death of Jesus every dim and partial glimpse of truth developed into an 'immortal feature of loveliness and perfection.'

In work so scrupulously scientific as Dr. Frazer's we do not expect to find the author's personal opinions obtruded on matters lying outside the realm of pure science. The materialist and the Christian are free to use his facts and theories as they will, and there is no *ipse dixit* to determine their choice. Dr. Frazer's own beliefs are not those of orthodox Christianity, but no one who knows him could regard him as a foe to true religion, however stern he is towards some of its worn-out forms.[1] His sympathetic appreciation of the Bible has been superbly shown in the collection of 'passages chosen for their literary beauty and interest,' which reappeared in enlarged form two years ago, adorned with valuable notes, literary and anthropological. We cannot close better than by quoting from the exquisite Preface to that edition :—

> Though many of us can no longer, like our fathers, find in its pages the solution of the dark, the inscrutable riddle of human existence, yet the volume must still be held sacred by all who reverence the high aspirations to which it gives utterance, and the pathetic associations with which the faith and piety of so many generations have invested the familiar words. The reading of it breaks into the dull round of common life like a shaft of sunlight on a cloudy day, or a strain of solemn music heard in a mean street. It seems to lift us for a while out of ourselves, our little cares and little sorrows, into communion with those higher powers, whatever they are, which existed before man began to be, and which will exist when the whole human race, as we are daily reminded by the cataclysms and convulsions of nature, shall be swept out of existence for ever. It strengthens in us the blind conviction, or the trembling hope that somewhere, beyond these earthly shadows, there is a world of light eternal, where the obstinate questionings of the mind will be answered, and the heart find rest.

---

[1] Since this was written, Dr. Frazer has been delivering the first series of his Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews, on the 'Belief in Immortality, regarded as a Stage in the Evolution of Religion among the Lower Races.' The syllabus of the first two lectures especially, on the 'Scope of Natural Theology,' suggests that the volume will be extremely interesting to Christian thinkers.

PARSISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Among all the fields of Christian missionary enterprise, we can hardly find one which has yielded so little as that which forms the subject of the present paper. We read in histories of missions how two Parsi converts were made in the year 1839. But they have had exceedingly few successors. The very knowledge that Christian propagandists were aiming by educational work to win an entrance for their religion set the Parsis on their guard. The concentration of Western learning on the problems of Zend and Pahlavi, on the religious and social antiquities of Iran, has awakened a corresponding activity among the Parsis themselves. Old errors have been eliminated and weak points corrected. And to-day we find that the 'Anglo-Saxons of the East,' the most enterprising, enlightened, and charitable community in India, present a practically impregnable defence against the few attempts that are made to bring to them the blessings of the Gospel. Such attempts are purely incidental, for no organised mission, Protestant or Roman Catholic, is in existence, nor does it seem as if it would be advisable to establish one. The utmost that seems possible is the cultivation of friendly personal relations with the Parsis, in the hope that they will come to understand better the essence of the faith, and be drawn towards it by its own inherent power.

The maxim which teaches that 'the good is the enemy of the best' may be confidently cited as the sufficient cause for all this failure. The sympathetic student of Zoroastrianism, as he investigates its history, its sacred books, and the character of its present exponents, finds at every turn much to admire, and exceedingly little to condemn. He realises that he is studying a religion which never—with one strange and partial exception, as we shall see presently—inculcated what was morally wrong, which stood for the unity and holiness of God in a world of debasing polytheism, and taught the immortality of man, and reward and punishment on ethical principles in a future life, long before such doctrines emerged among the people of Israel. A tiny community, probably less than a hundred thousand, the Parsis have preserved their nationality and their faith for a dozen centuries in the country which gave them shelter from the deadly dilemma offered them in their own land by the fanaticism of Islam. Most of those who stayed in Persia preferred the Koran to the sword. The Parsis of modern India are the sons of those who refused the former and escaped the latter at the cost of a permanent exile. They have every right to be proud of their heritage; and if a people, influential out of all proportion to their numbers, progressive and enlightened beyond all other races in India, and devoted to a religion singularly pure and lofty, refuse to consider the higher claims of what seems to them an alien faith, we can hardly regard it as strange.

The origins of Zoroastrianism are buried in the mists of prehistoric antiquity. To discuss their problems here would be impossible; but there is one important caution that needs to be given before students attempt to explore for themselves. The Avesta is accessible in English, translated by scholars of the highest eminence for Max Müller's magnificent series, *Sacred Books of the East* (vols. iv., xxiii., and xxxi.). The first two of these were executed by one of the greatest Orientalists who ever lived, James Darmesteter. He crowded into his brief life of little over forty years a mass of brilliant pioneer labour in many fields, unequalled in quality, and amazing in quantity for a man whose life was a constant struggle with physical weakness. A year or two before he died he propounded what Iranian scholars without exception pronounce to be an impossible paradox concerning the history of the Avesta. It was stated fully in his monumental French translation, and repeated in the Introduction to the first volume of the *Sacred Books of the East*, Avesta in its second edition.[1] Within a few months the great scholar died, and we are at liberty to believe that a few years of further study would have caused him to abandon the too hasty conjecture with which he marred the last and greatest work of his life. It is necessary, therefore, to warn the non-specialist student that in this one matter it is not safe to follow the scholar who in all other points is our weightiest authority. According to the prevailing opinion, the oldest part of the Avesta dates back at least to the seventh century B.C. The traditional date for the life of the prophet Zarathushtra (Zoroaster, as the Greeks called him) is from 660 B.C. to 583 B.C. Professor A. V. Williams Jackson of New York, in his authoritative monograph [2] on the great reformer's life, gives weighty reasons for accepting the tradition; and the same view is taken by the late Dr. E. W. West, and by Bishop Casartelli, the highest authorities this country has produced. The only question is whether we ought not to substitute a still earlier era. Another vital point on which opinion has decisively turned against Darmesteter is the historical reality of Zarathushtra's personality. Myths in plenty have gathered round his name, but the strikingly human portrait which comes out of the Gâthâs or Hymns—largely, we may believe, his own composition—can safely be accepted as genuine. It provides us, however, with but little biography. There is evidence of success in preaching in the names of certain disciples, especially Vîshtâspa, the Constantine of the new faith; and there is also a plaintive lament from a period of failure and persecution. There seems reason to believe that Zarathushtra began his work in Media, but failed there, and wandered east into Bactria, where he won his royal patron, and began a success which lasted till his death in advanced years.

---

[1] He put the Gâthâs (see below) in the first century A.D., and traced their most characteristic doctrines to the influence of Philo of Alexandria.

[2] *Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran.* Columbia University Press, 1899.

And what was the nature of Zarathushtra's reform? We may probably assume that the religion he found in possession was very much like that which Herodotus described as it prevailed among the Persians, a little before the era when the Zoroastrian reformed faith slowly percolated into Media from the east. It was nature-worship, but of a relatively pure kind. The supreme Indo-Germanic deity, the Sky Father, whose name meets us in India, Greece, and Rome, and survives in our own *Tues*-day, was worshipped without priesthood or temples on mountain-tops; while sun and moon, wind and water and fire were all reverenced. In particular Mithra, the god of the upper air, mediator between heaven and earth, held primacy in the popular religion which in later days was to pass from Asia to Europe and confront Christianity with the only rival faith that ever seriously contested the allegiance of the West. Zarathushtra's mind seems to have been extraordinarily abstract for the time at which he appeared. In verse, the philosophic obscurity of which curiously contrasts with its extremely primitive language,[1] he preaches his fervent monotheism, his strong and healthy doctrine of truthfulness and honest toil, his promise of eternal bliss with God in the 'House of Song,' for those who have practised 'good thoughts, good words, good deeds,' in this life. He does not name the old-nature gods whom he strove to dethrone. His methods strikingly remind us of St. Paul's in his dealing with the Colossian heresy—no counter-theorising about the angels whose worship he would abolish, but a new and forceful assertion of the infinite transcendence of the Son of God, whose universal lordship made the very existence of other spiritual beings almost a matter of indifference from the practical point of view. We recognise in this procedure of the first and greatest of Christian missionaries a most important lesson for our own missionary policy at home and abroad to-day. Error is to be destroyed by constructive methods far more than by polemic. Set Christ, in theory and in practice, where He ought to stand, and all limited, false, or pernicious doctrine will fall into its proper place. Now St. Paul admittedly succeeded in his object of destroying a virtual polytheism under guise of angelolatry. Zarathushtra has clearly failed, and we must study the lessons of his failure. No real flaw can be pointed out in the thorough-going character of his monotheism. He may have found in partial or general use the title Ahura Mazdâh (Ormazd), 'Wise Lord,' which excludes all others in his system as the name of Deity; though personally I think it more probable that this was at most an occasional epithet of Dyaus, the Sky.[1] In any case, I think we can recognise the prophet's own mind in the other new names of the system. In place of the old nature-powers we find six archangels around the Throne. They are mostly mere personified attributes of God. One of them, indeed, Spenta Armaiti ('Holy Devotion'), is allowed to retain traces of the physical connection she had long possessed as genius of the earth; while others seem to keep a similar patronage which may have belonged to deities whom they dispossessed. Zarathushtra presumably selected a few genii of the old faith, whose character was abstract enough for his purpose, exalted them into archangels reflecting various attributes of God, and allowed to remain as innocuous their old connection with metals, fire, water, plants, etc. The names of the six Amshaspands (Amesha Spenta, 'immortal holy ones') are enough to show that they tempted no idolatry and did not compromise a rigid monotheism. Good Mind, Best Righteousness, Desired Sovranty, Holy Devotion, Health, and Immortality are too impersonal and abstract to encourage any diversion of allegiance from Him with whom in the Gâthâs they are perpetually associated in the closest way. We may safely attribute to the same profound mind the conceptions of evil powers which are posited to explain the existence of pain and wrong. Angra Mainyu (Ahriman, 'hurtful spirit') and Aeshma Daeva (Asmodaeus of 'Tobit,' 'wrath demon') have the characteristic mark of abstractness, which suggests Zarathushtra's own mintage. It is quite unfair, by the way, to call Zarathushtra's system dualistic. He traced all physical and moral evil to a spirit who in the beginning chose evil in thought, word, and deed. Life is to be a ceaseless strife with the Evil One and all his creation. And at the last shall come Saoshyant ('He who shall save' [1]), a miraculously born son of Zarathushtra. He will let loose from heaven the flood of molten metal which will purify creation, and destroy—or possibly transform into powers of good—Ahriman and all his creatures, so that

---

[1] The peculiarly close relation of the Gâthic Zend to Vedic Sanskrit is one of the main arguments for the early date of the Hymns. It seems almost impossible to put more than a short interval between dialects so closely akin.

---

[1] Cf. Herodotus, i. 131, τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Δία καλέοντες. I must remind the reader that my differentiation between pre-Zoroastrian elements, Zoroastrian, and post-Zoroastrian is theory and not dogma; I cannot argue my case here.

> Hell itself will pass away,
> And leave her dolorous mansions to the peering day.

A system in which Good is eventually to win a complete and everlasting triumph is no more 'dualistic' than the New Testament itself.

---

[1] For this eschatology the hints in the Gâthâs are too scanty to depend on: we draw from the later Avesta. It may be necessary to observe that a recent attempt in the *Hibbert Journal* to connect the Babylonian *Shamash*, *Shawash*, the sun, breaks down on an elementary fact of Zend grammar: the *sh* is part of the suffix of the future tense.

Now mark the sequel. In the archaic dialect in which the Gâthâs are composed we possess a prose liturgy called the 'Gâthâ of seven chapters.' Its language shows that it cannot have been composed long after the metrical Hymns, and its birthplace must likewise be near theirs: the alternative hypothesis of an artificial sacred dialect does not seem probable, as we should have to postulate yet another considerable gap of time or place (or both) before coming to the later Avesta. Now in this prose Gâthâ the old nature-worship is back again, and back to stay. The Yashts, which form a whole division of the later Avesta, written in a different metre and a markedly distinct dialect, consist entirely of hymns to the old nature-powers. They were regularised in orthodox Parsism by being treated as subordinate spirits, answering to our angels; but in the Yashts the worship paid to them is not to be distinguished from that which is given to the Supreme Being. Zarathushtra had striven to raise men above their inherited thoughts of God; but reversion to type set in, as it always does as soon as the force of a great religious reform is spent. The contrast between Parsism and Hinduism, which sprang from the same ancestor, is the measure of his success. But it is abundantly true of this great religion, as of every other that owes its essential features to an individual religious genius, that the motto 'Back to the Founder' expresses the utmost advance of which the religion is capable. The secret of Zarathushtra's failure to make permanent his great ideas lies in the impossibility of teaching ordinary men to worship an abstraction. The ordinary Israelite under the Monarchy was perpetually 'exchanging Jahweh for another god' who came within the range of his senses. And the God of the Old Testament is incomparably more personal, more knowable, more lovable than the rather negative All-Wise and All-Holy whom Zarathushtra adored. Whether conceived as the Absolute and Unconditioned of the metaphysician, the Infinite Intelligence and Supreme Artificer of the Parsi, or even the Fatherly Providence of the Jew, He remained to the masses of men an Unknown God till 'God Only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father . . . declared Him' by coming in our flesh to be a Man with men.

The simple grandeur of Zarathushtra's creed was destined to be adulterated with yet another kind of alien element before the development of Parsism was complete. Herodotus tells us the names of the six tribes or castes into which the population of Media was divided. Since one of these is expressly designated as Aryan, it seems to follow that the other five had no part in the sturdy Northern race which had swept into Asia and Southern Europe, making easy conquests of the aboriginal populations which in a few generations absorbed them. Among these five tribes the historian names the Magi. He tells, as does Darius in his great inscription at Behistun, how a Magian usurper seized the throne after the death of Cambyses. It was a religious as well as a racial revolution. When Darius and his Persians came to their own again, the political hopes of this powerful native tribe were finally destroyed. But they had another road to power open to them. Various indications point to their having been a sacred caste, like the Brahmins in India. The Bible, if I read the evidence rightly, gives us two glimpses of their religion before its fusion with Zoroastrianism. The Rab-Mag of Jer. xxxix. 3, 13 is best taken as an Archimagus of this early period. And the curious heathen rite described in Ezek. viii. 17, identical as it is with one still practised by Parsi priests, is explained immediately when we attribute it to the Magi as independent of the system into which they subsequently imparted this and many other ritual observances of their own. It is very easy to believe that the people of Media, when court influence, in or after the time of Darius, brought the Zoroastrian religion more and more into vogue, gladly admitted the old sacred caste, their own kith and kin, to perform the priestly duties attaching to the new faith. And that being so, the Magi were sure to introduce as much as possible of their old ritual into a religion which had remarkably little ritual of its own. Hence, I venture to believe, the Vendîdâd—the dull and sometimes repulsive ritual code which even the Parsis themselves often interpret so freely as to suggest that it is a yoke which neither they nor their fathers have been wholly able to bear. In some important respects the Magi failed to impress their beliefs upon the system. Their practice of magic was so conspicuous that the Greeks actually named occult arts from them, as we do still; but magic and sorcery are sternly banned by Parsism. Astrology and divination by dreams—both of them prominent in the narrative of Matthew ii.—were special pursuits of the Magi, but they found no place in the Avesta, nor even in the later official literature of the Parsis. Greek and Latin writers constantly select two strange practices as characteristic of the Magi—the exposure of the bodies of the dead to vultures, and the supreme religious merit of the marriage of the closest kin. The former became one of the most conspicuous features of Zoroastrianism, as the 'Towers of Silence' at Bombay witness still. The latter is almost certainly absent from the Avesta, and it has never been practised by the Parsis, despite the exaggerated enthusiasm with which it is preached in their later literature.

We come now to the most important subject of our study. Not only in the relatively unimportant field of angelology and demonology, but also in the momentous question of a future life, we find a great change passing over Judaism just after the era in which the Jews had been in close contact with the Persians, and had, moreover, owed to them the restoration of their nationality and their ancestral home. *Post hoc propter hoc* was the very natural conclusion of many scholars who realised how near the Pharisee stood to the Parsi. Put in that crude way, the theory is as obvious, and as untenable, as the notion that the Pharisees owed their name to their supposed Persian leanings. But indirect borrowing between religions is as common as open transference of ideas and beliefs is rare. Devout and earnest Jews who knew that Persian religion taught immortality, with rewards and punishments on an ethical basis, were driven to thought and prayer by the utter blankness of their own outlook. The Providence which kept this living hope from the Jews till the very eve of the Great Revelation explains itself readily to the modern point of view. The actual religious value of a great idea depends less on the idea itself than on the manner of its attainment. Zarathushtra preached an exalted doctrine of a future life centuries before it entered the minds of Jews. The idea was not new even then. The ancient nature-worship of the Aryans proper, before they divided into the Indian and Persian branches, included a belief in immortality which was presumably based upon the analogy of nature, as when we find in the Rigveda the beautiful saying that the Dawn is *amrtasya ketuh*, 'the banner of immortality.' To this Zarathushtra himself may have added the conception of a Theodicy, which has led so many earnest souls to cling to the hope of a triumph of right beyond the grave. But no one can read the Psalms thoughtfully without realising that the Jews found a yet more excellent way to the Truth. National hopes faded more and more; but the men who found that they served their God for naught, as far as material reward went, realised an infinitely greater reward in the deepening sense of the presence of Jehovah, and the unspeakable peace and comfort enjoyed in communion with Him. It was inevitable that men so trained should make the great venture: 'He calls Himself *my* God. He is eternal, I must die. But how *can* He suffer the man of His love to be abandoned to corruption, to a world in which there is no remembrance of Him? Because

He lives, I must live also.' In other words, the pious Jew came to the 'hope full of immortality' by the road which our Lord pointed out to the Sadducees. But that does not prevent the action of a providential παραζήλωσις, a challenge to faith by the known existence of so comforting a doctrine elsewhere.

Space forbids our dwelling on the Zoroastrian doctrine of the future, which would demand some pages to itself. For some of its most beautiful features I might be allowed to refer to a free adaptation from the Avesta entitled 'A Zoroastrian Idyll,' in the *Expository Times* for September 1907.[1] In all the range of non-Christian religions there could hardly be found a more exquisite conception than that of the fair angel who is borne on the wings of a fragrant south wind to meet the good man's soul, thus answering his astonished inquiry:—

> I am Thyself,
> Thy thoughts, thy words, thy actions, glorified
> By every conquest over base desire,
> By every offering of a holy prayer
> To the Wise Lord in Heaven, every deed
> Of kindly help done to the good and pure;
> By these I come thus lovely, come to guide
> Thy steps to that dread Bridge where waits for thee
> The Prophet charged with judgment.

We shall, I think, be easily persuaded that a faith which included such gems of truth was worthiest to represent the Gentile world in the first deed of homage done to the infant Son of Man.

And we shall likewise agree, I trust, that the Christian world owes to the present-day holders of this noble and ancient faith a very special debt of interest and sympathy. They have throughout the history of Christian Missions in India shown an almost unbroken front against those who have tried to win them. It is not strange that the difficulty of the task and the immeasurably greater numbers and greater need of the masses who have nothing better than Hinduism to rest on, should have discouraged the organising of special work among the Parsis. The greater need of the Hindu needs no proof. But does not Christ need the Parsi ? How invaluable for the Christian India of the future must this little community be, so honest and truth-loving, so free from the accumulated burdens which ages of superstition and the manifold horrors of the caste system have imposed on the Hindu ? For the Parsi, Jesus Christ comes not to destroy but to fulfil, to be a Saoshyant beyond anything that Zarathushtra dreamed. Nor will it be before He comes to complete and crown the broken arch of truth, reared by the seekers after God in many lands, that humanity at last will be perfected and the new day dawn for the world. Christianity itself can never be perfect while it remains only the Western view of the universal Christ. Through Eastern windows that light must pour in, if the great world temple is to be made ready for the high festival of the Kingdom Come ; and then we shall see with amazement how many hues break upon us for the first time. And among all such new lights the strongest and purest will be seen when once more the Star shines in the East, and the Wise Men of Zarathushtra's company find their Saviour and rejoice with exceeding great joy.

---

[1] I should perhaps also refer, for some important questions which have had to be passed over here, to the article 'Zoroastrianism,' in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv.

THE PARSIS IN INDIA

FIVE and a half months in India gave scanty qualification for making broad inductions on missionary problems. But I have passed the half-way house in my Indian pilgrimage ; and some things that a wayfaring man can hardly miss may be set down with much diffidence, by way of sequel to the paper on 'Parsism and Christianity' which the diligent reader may unearth from a back number of the *East and the West* (vol. v. pp. 408-18). An appreciative outsider values the privilege of writing where back numbers are likely to be kept !

It is hardly possible to avoid a rather frequent 'I' in the opening of notes which must take the form of a personal narrative. When I wrote on Parsi religion in these pages nothing seemed less likely than that I should ever see the Parsis in their own home. But universities and theological colleges can easily spare their staff in these sad days ; and the Y.M.C.A. has seized the opportunity. The Association has, of course, lost most of its British young men on its Indian staff ; and to redress the balance somewhat three seniors have been invited out for special work, Dr. T. R. Glover from Cambridge, Professor E. H. Leonard from Bristol, and myself, with another trio to take our place in the autumn. My own commission was to use my past studies in the early history and literature of Zoroastrianism, and follow them up with personal study of the Parsi community. My appointment to a temporary Readership in 'Aryan Antiquities' in Bombay University enabled me to exchange empty class-rooms in Manchester for excellent audiences of

Hindus and Parsis in the Convocation Hall, and before my three months in the city were over I had experienced the cordial welcome that educated Parsis extend to visitors from the West who have given sympathetic study to the monuments of their religion. The fruits of much personal intercourse with this interesting people will be reserved for an attempted interpretation which forms the ultimate object of my brief mission. But here I should speak of a very significant invitation which resulted in five Saturday afternoon addresses to Parsi gatherings in a theatre. The Parsis who asked me were much concerned at the 'lack of spiritual food' conspicuous in the present generation. The addresses were consequently sermons, and not academic lectures. There were two or three hundred very attentive hearers each time; and the printed page, in English and in Gujarati editions, will be left to make its appeal when the speaker has gone home. I have dared to cherish the belief that some Parsis will be better Parsis for having their thoughts recalled to the 'Teaching of Zarathushtra.' Better able to value the gold which their own Magi had to offer to the world's Saviour, and less concerned with the dross that later ages have accumulated.

This will seem, perhaps, a limited ambition for one who in his first address to the Parsis frankly proclaimed himself a Christian, and therefore a missionary. In my former paper I explained, not only why the Parsis are worth winning to the Faith of Christ, but also how hard they would be to win. A paragraph should be added here to show why 'Back to Zarathushtra' is the first step towards the Kingdom of God. It is a step which Parsis may be induced to take without much difficulty. The Gâthâs, or Hymns, of Zarathushtra (Zoroaster), the Prophet of Iran, are the very kernel of the Avesta for all Parsis, and their entire contents are perpetually recited in worship. A Parsi will plead that the Gâthâs are very short, having lost in the ages companion texts of much greater bulk:

it is right, therefore, that the later Avesta and the Rabbinic literature (as we might call the Pahlavi texts) should supplement their teaching. But he is quite open to the argument that the Gâthâs must stand first, must be the norm by which all later teaching is to be interpreted.

A few words will suffice to show why it was worth while for a Christian missionary to expound successively the 'Doctrine of God,' 'Evil,' 'Soul and Body,' the 'Future State,' and 'Religion, Ritual, and Conduct,' with the Gâthâs for his text. The text has the negative advantage that nothing worse can be found in it than the obscurity of one who 'uttered nothing base,' but wrote in a highly compressed style in a language that has been extinct for nearly three thousand years. No immoral, untrue, or grievously one-sided doctrine needs to be corrected: a Parsi whose faith is drawn from the Gâthâs will have nothing to unlearn when he enters the school of Christ. And on the positive side, the Gâthâs abound in teaching which a Christian can expound with joy, and with a sense of familiarity. (For the filling out of these bare assertions I may refer to my Hibbert Lectures on 'Early Zoroastrianism.') The 'Wise Lord' stands alone in a perfectly pure monotheism. But some of his greatest attributes are personified, not, I am convinced, as archangels outside his person, but as distinct personalities within the Godhead. The Christian thinker recognises a real approach to a central feature in the doctrine of the Trinity. The unity can only be realised when the diversity is seen: the 'white radiance' is a rainbow blended into one hue. The doctrine of evil, as Zarathushtra preached it, is no dualism, but truly identical with our own. So is that of an ethical Hereafter, and the fervid assertion of the spiritual as the supreme factor in life. How easy to begin from such 'scriptures' and preach to them Jesus! That could not be—not yet; but there were a great many things in those addresses which the speaker had not learnt from Zarathushtra, but read into him! Like all the members of the goodly fellowship, the Prophet of Iran wrote better than he knew. Unhappily the later scriptures of Zoroastrianism are very far from keeping up to this level. They supplied the religion with externals, and in this no doubt necessary work they achieved a very equivocal success. As so often happens, the externals have usurped much more than their rightful share of attention, and have provoked schisms which would never have arisen if men's minds and hearts had been centred upon the spiritual that is within. The result is a condition very distressing to the best minds in the Parsi community. The Parsis are sharply divided into two parties, who spend all their energies in fighting one another, and cannot be got to see any redeeming features in their opponents. The 'so-called Orthodox' and the 'so-called Reformers' have both got much to say for themselves; and a friendly outsider like myself would gladly combine their good points, and leave many things open as depending legitimately on individual temperament. (A course which a good many not unwise people would greatly like to take with Christendom!) The name 'Reformers' at first hearing claims sympathy from one of my own ecclesiastical position. Prayers in a dead language, tedious, and often repulsive ceremonial —one has an instinctive fellow-feeling with those who want to reform such things; and it is difficult to understand the temper of believers who will compass sea and land to prevent the making of one proselyte to their faith. But this initial sympathy soon wavers when it appears that the party has none of the positive note which rings for us in the word 'Reformation.' It is a party of iconoclasm, of denial, not of 'protestation,' glad and confident assertion. In their hands the pride of Zoroastrianism is that it has a minimum of dogma, and restricts the supernatural to a bare theism. They cling to the healthy ethics of their faith, but cannot see how small a chance in the struggle with temptation has ‘morality untouched with emotion.’ Their religion ‘is so simple in its tenets that it differs but little from Unitarianism or rationalism.’ The charming and high-minded leader who let this luckless comparison escape him little realised how sterile such ‘simplicity’ must inevitably become. The train is at the bottom of a steep gradient, and the engine fire is nearly out. I may quote from the same official address my friend’s definition of Parsi faith as ‘a very simple belief in an omniscient, all-bountiful, and omnipotent God, who insists on good thought, good word, and good action, and ordains evil to the evil doer, and blessings to the pure both in this world and the next, according to their thoughts, words, and deeds.’ A Unitarian could accept this and even some rationalists. There is a flavour of pure reason about it, and we can understand its appeal to an educated Parsi who during three years at Oxford or Cambridge has grown weary of solemnly tying and untying his kusti several times a day, and repeating *ashem vohu* with a very vague idea of the meaning of that hoary formula—to say nothing of washing in and even sipping a liquid which the West is too polite to mention.

And yet this ‘very simple belief’ is assailed from opposite quarters by foes whom it is no easier to beat off because the believer has so little to defend. Superstition is strongly entrenched when its pleaders are the womenfolk of the young man’s family, and the public opinion of a small but very proud community. On the other side, well—*cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*, but these traveller’s pockets are not yet quite empty. What proof is there of ‘an omniscient, all-bountiful, and omnipotent God,’ who will reward and punish in this life and the next according to desert? It is not easy to be found in Huxley and Spencer, who represent the last word of the West. (The freight of ideas takes time, and an antepenultimate philosophy has a chance of renewed life out here.) Meanwhile Eastern environment is not very helpful. Which of

Hinduism's three hundred and thirty million gods will encourage the Parsi doubter to retain any of these high conceptions of deity? Allah the All-Merciful might help him, but Allah and Ormazd rather markedly disagree in their judgment upon murder and lust, if we may determine the theology of Islam by Moslem practice. So behind a faith that rests in unstable equilibrium there lurks a yet more insidious plotter to push it down the hill. 'The world is too much with us,' all of us; but the Parsi inheritor of wealth and a genius for business, encumbered with very little to force religion inconveniently upon him, succumbs easily to sheer materialism of practice. *One* gift the West holds in trust for him, a gift he might accept without sacrificing a jot or tittle of the 'very simple belief' distilled accurately enough from the Hymns of Zarathushtra. Its acceptance would send new life-blood coursing through the senile frame of Zoroastrianism. But no! the cultured Parsi will quote the Bible as readily as Shakespeare, and he shows no sort of prejudice against the religion of the Briton whose language and customs and clothes he assimilates so easily. But to become a Christian himself—no! that is quite another affair. 'Reform' in religion is excellent, if it means virility substituted for the senile, new, and pure ideals for those that wax aged and are nigh unto vanishing away. But if it can only throw stones at hoary images which still mean something for genuine worshippers, and leave *vacuam sedem, inania arcana*, but with no Real Presence more deeply interfused (hungry hearts will think the old better), To the Orthodox, the mass of the Parsi community, I came with decidedly different presuppositions. By temperament indifferent to the ceremonial side of religion, I try to cultivate absolute tolerance of any ritual that some one else finds a means of grace: it is the grace that matters, not the channel. But in a party so given over to ritual, and such ritual, I hardly expected to find much that met my own ways of thought. I did find some real piety, the supreme object of my search, and a few rare souls to whom God meant everything. One who specially attracted me was a young solicitor, author of a devotional commentary on the Gâthâs, which he has illustrated stanza by stanza from an encyclopaedic reading in a religious literature—Gospels and Upanishads, Thomas à Kempis and Spurgeon, brought together by most Catholic eclecticism. He told me how he spent three years in severe conflict of soul. The claims of Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, presented themselves powerfully to him, and for each of these he conceived a warm admiration, based on a sincere study of the sacred books. But when it came to adopting any one of them, he found himself up against a stone wall. God causes every soul to be born in a religious environment providentially suited to it. His was Zoroastrian, and he could never leave it for another.

By far the most violent strife between the parties rages round the question of proselytising. The majority are afraid that the select caste of their community may be degraded by an influx of sweepers, eager to share the Parsi charities in life, and the coveted privilege of going to the vultures after death. The minority fear the ultimate extinction of a race which cannot recruit from outside, through the decreasing marriage rate and the growth of luxury. They want to be free to bring in cultured outsiders, such as the French lady who married into the wealthy Tata family, and by that marriage, ‘like another Helen fired another Troy.’ Hence unlimited bitterness, and endless litigation, for the Parsis have no scruples about going to law before unbelievers. The ‘unbeliever’ will be impartial: a Parsi judge has been known to carry his individual prejudices so far as to declare from the bench that a Parsi of the other party had been ‘actuated by mercenary considerations’ in the formation of his opinions! In the Rangoon proselytism case, soon to come into court, evidence is now being taken in Bombay, and one distinguished witness has been examined for thirty hours! This curious state of things is liable to betray a visitor into a *faux pas.* He speaks warmly of the purity of the Parsi doctrine of God, and wishes it might supplant the devil-worships of Hinduism. And instead of his auditors being gratified by his tribute, he finds them instantly convinced that he is advocating proselytism. Jubilation or abuse follows accordingly. Of anything like missionary feeling towards the masses of India there seems not a trace on either side. Religious passion is only raised by the prospect of other Parsi wigs on the green.

I need not stay to apportion blame to one party or the other for this sad condition of affairs, or to show my own impartiality by accusing both. It is needless to say more of such perils as rationalism and worldliness which Christian churches know all too well. But there is a novel development within the orthodox fold which demands some notice because it is peculiarly Indian. It illustrates the temper of educated India in this period of early adolescence—adolescence sorely afflicted with growing-pains!

If by a wild flight of imagination one could conceive the great British public interested in India, it might seem superfluous to tell them that the present is a period of reactionary Orientalism. The East has received from well-meaning Westerners flattery that has been bad for its digestion. India is such a religious country, a paradise of the mystic, where everybody is meditating profoundly on things for which the materialistic West has no time to spare, and no capacity! May I confess myself rather disillusioned, through others' experience more than my own, which is not long enough to trust? I have, of purpose, seen but little of my own countrymen, except the missionaries, whose sympathy with the Indian was as deep as my own. It is no prejudice of the ruling class that has formed my impressions of the educated native of India.

I am convinced that the college-trained Indian of to-day needs a subcutaneous injection of home truths, administered as kindly and anæsthetically as possible, but with no weakening of the salutary drug. Look at his history. In his youth he works for a degree, which is the very goal of existence—the hall-mark of culture, and the door to all the lucrative professions and posts under Government which in his dreams are competing for his services. He gets the B.A. on thirty per cent. in each subject, and accumulates those precious thirty pieces mainly by rote-learning of text-books. Happy is the teacher who can get his boys to show a gleam of initiative and think for themselves. When he keeps up studious pursuits in after life the same vices pursue him, but he is not humble and teachable as of yore. We present to him the equation '$2+2=4$.' 'The West says so,' he replies, 'we make it 3, or under certain circumstances 17.' I am hardly parodying the tones of a Brahmin gentleman at the top of his profession who, after a public reference to 'truths taught by the Gospels two thousand years ago, and by the Vedas twenty thousand,' used the opening phrase of my summary when I remarked to him (on Professor Macdonell's authority) that the Veda knew nothing of reincarnation. I have had to argue solemnly with really learned Parsis, who, when I expressed my opinion that Zarathushtra must be dated as far back as the tenth or eleventh century B.C., replied, 'So recent ?' They would pile on two to five extra millennia, and when the Western mind showed scruples assume that we were modern Joshuas, jealous for Moses' sake. Such things, of course, do not matter, except as symptoms of a state of mind. It becomes tragic when Eastern medicine—putting aside what there may be of pharmacy that science can approve—steps into competition with the West. Missionary doctors have told me of lives they could have saved, but their patients were removed from the clean hospital and watchful and experienced care, to the dirt and the spells and the doctor learned in 'native science.' 'The West says that dirt will produce blood-poisoning.' The East denies it—who shall decide when doctors disagree ? The West might plead the patient's death as evidence. But that is not written in the Veda. It is this mental attitude that accounts for the hold of theosophy out here. We can hardly say perhaps that such a quintessence of delirious rubbish could never have been distilled in the West, for there are Westerners, some fools and some knaves, who are deeply implicated in the growth of this portentous fraud. But its wide acceptance in India shows how cleverly the late 'H. P. B.' and her present prophetess divined what kind of goods would suit the Indian market. Of course I am not referring to doctrines which existed ages before Mrs. Besant 'attained her present incarnation.' Karma was no more invented by the Theosophical Society than was the doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man, of which Mrs. Besant presumably heard first in her churchgoing days. Mahatmas, at present resident in Tibet, but prepared to flit before the explorer and play hide-and-seek with new Pearys round the North Pole—'earliest copies' of the Apostles' Creed, 'clairvoyancy, seen by investigators' of occult qualifications, and setting forth strange doctrine in Greek words unknown to the dictionary—grotesque and sometimes immoral speculations as to the past and future of our world—such things make the stock-in-trade of the new and much more pernicious Gnosticism of to-day. The Western reader is content to listen with amused incredulity for a few minutes, till he is bored and passes on. But a country whose instinct for evidence is almost non-existent accepts it all as proven. And the astonishing thing is that the Parsis have so largely fallen under the spell. Reincarnation, not merely absent from but hopelessly inconsistent with the teaching of their Prophet, is made to fit into their 'orthodox' creed. They have learnt from the T. S. how to give a truly scientific flavour to the case for praying in a dead language. Just as you may ('tis said) fiddle a bridge down if you can get the exact note to which it vibrates, so may evil things be destroyed by the vibrations excited by the *ipsissima verba* of the holy hymns. The Mobed in the ritual touches 'the edge of the fire-altar with the fire-spoon after having established contact with the other priest or priests by holding one another's hands. . . . The practice clearly points to a thermo-electrisation.' The able and upright Parsi scholars whom I quote are not active members of the T. S., which has been cold-shouldered by Parsi leaders since it took to condoning immorality. But even one of these, an Oxford man, and experienced in the public service, dissented in conversation from a condemnation of theosophy, for it had been of great service to the Parsis in reviving spirituality. Some people would say the same of Spiritualism. Many people in the days when Dionysus reigned in Thrace said the same of spirituous liquor. *Haud tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!* And all the time we can hear the 'majestic instancy' of a voice that calls them still. Their priests heard it in the olden time, and came with gifts and exceeding great joy to see the Babe in the Manger who was the God of 'Endless Time.' And now the voice calls their forwandered successor, and says with tender reproach, 'All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.'

. . . .

So from the tragic picture of a world that 'through its theosophy knew not God,' let us turn for encouragement to a stratum of society in which the Cross won its earliest triumphs.

A large proportion of the inhabitants of India are 'untouchable.' Hinduism claims them—when census time is near. At other times the Hindu draws back his garment's hem for fear of defilement. But to-day there is one who puts forth His hand and touches the untouchable, as He touched the leper of old; and Christian missionaries in North and South witness the sequel with awe and rejoicing. Are we watching the first movements of a general upheaval? Is a torrent from the heights pouring down the glen into the still, frozen lake, to break up the ice from beneath, and bring the springtide into this sad country?

Let me set down in a few words what I saw in two stations of my own Society, rejoicing greatly that other Societies can show so much to match it. I spent three days in March with the Rev. G. M. Kerr, of the W.M.S., Nizamabad. Since last August over two thousand Malas and over sixty caste people have been baptized in this district. In each case the appeal came from a whole village, pleading for a teacher to tell them of the new religion. A catechist was sent to teach them what the religion meant. His wife taught the children. He gave them the Gospel story, set to the native lyrics and sung into the memory; also the Commandments and the Creed, simplified for their childlike understandings; and he instructed them in practical rules of Christian conduct. When they knew sufficiently well to what they were pledging themselves, the missionary baptized them, generally a whole village at a time, for they always held together in their eager desire. The catechist was then able to go on with his training with a firmer hold upon them. Relatives and marriage connections in other villages soon heard of it, and more appeals for teachers followed in embarrassing profusion. The initial motive naturally varied—the prospect of education for the children, and of an Englishman's counsel and encouragement in withstanding the little tyrant of their fields, or, again, very often a grateful memory of wonderful cures in the Mission Hospital at Nizamabad, where Dr. Kerr, my friend's wife, ministers with a colleague. But whatever the original impulse, the quality of the results was beyond question. In four typical villages I saw a Christian crowd gathered, a neighbouring village or two in each case sending its contingent. One of these meetings was in the early morning in a rude building that served for a church, the others late at night in the moonlit street or on the village green when the toils of field work were over. In addition to these meetings I addressed—of course through the missionary as interpreter—a gathering of several hundred Christians in a shady field near Medak one morning in the following week. Medak is the headquarters of our work, and a strong mission has been built up during the twenty years' service of the Rev. C. W. Posnett. In Medak we have our institution for the training of catechists, which is naturally the key of the situation : on the number and quality of the men trained there depends the extent to which we can cope with this remarkable movement towards Christ in the villages of many districts of the Nizam's dominions. The manifold evidences of uplift, the genuine and hearty acceptance of the faith visible everywhere among these simple people, lent new keenness to my own joy in the fact that the W.M.S. in 1915 surpassed its previous largest record in income by a thousand pounds. For to a large extent the length to which this movement will go depends on the number of teachers that we can supply and support.

The other scene is from a city, and that city Benares. Ten years ago, in squalid hovels, built on malodorous patches of ground allotted by the municipality, dwelt the city scavengers, the Doms. Their name (Dom) is probably to be traced in the familiar Romany, and nomad habits are apparent in them. They were hereditary thieves, and Hindu administration gave them no chance of reform. But a Christian missionary got hold of them, the Rev. C. P. Cape. Last November I went round the Dom settlements in his company. They are still scavengers ; but they have been taught that this is no disgrace, and they are honest and self-respecting, and have given up drinking, and with rare lapses witchcraft, for both of which they were notorious ; and the neat little homes which Mr. Cape has induced the municipality to build for its workpeople are suggestive of the transformation that their occupants have undergone. If the new Hindu University takes up research in social questions, here is an instructive subject at its doors! For demonstrator they might engage a Dom who is already a graduate of Allahabad University! I saw many strange and many beautiful sights in the Hindu metropolis, but one will outlast all others in my memory. It was only a lean-to roof and a clean mud floor and a dozen black-eyed gipsy children. They were saying the Creed. India will yet say it after them!

SYNCRETISM IN RELIGION

The infant science of Comparative Religion has developed so rapidly within the last few years that it begins to be possible to grope our way towards theories which may correlate the facts. There has been no lack of theorising indeed at any time since other peoples' religions first began to awaken a glimmer of interest other than the purely polemical. But the theories of former generations had a fatal disadvantage in that the facts on which they were based included nothing outside the sphere of civilised religions, or (what is not quite the same thing) the religions of civilised people. Facts were available in plenty from the records of travellers and missionaries; but they were mostly left to the missionary meeting or the popular lecture, and the scholars went on patenting their keys to all the mythologies without a notion of the methods which would soon be antiquating all their work. Like Christian and Hopeful, they had the key in their bosom all the time, but never thought of using it. Now that we know at any rate the direction in which to seek for guidance in our study, we may try very cautiously and tentatively to define the lines on which a scientific history of religion will have to be constructed.

The particular problem to be attacked in this paper is the interaction of one religion upon another, and the principles which must be observed in our study of the phenomena. It is needless to labour any proof of the importance of this syncretism as a factor in religious evolution. In every branch of sociology we see that progress is generally attained by cross-fertilisation between communities, sometimes fairly equal in level but differing in detail, sometimes widely distant from one another in the degree of civilisation arrived at. It may even be questioned whether any community has escaped sterility without the help of this external stimulus. Athens came as near absolute originality as any people we know of ; but did not even she borrow from the Semites the very alphabet with which her unrivalled literature was written down ? There is every reason to expect that similar principles will be found to work in the sphere of religion. In the physical world we are taught to believe that the method of the Creator's working may, within the limits of our knowledge, be described by the formula of Evolution. Theologians are no longer afraid of this language, and they are beginning to apply the principle to their own sphere of thought. It is *a priori* probable that gradual development, along the lines of more or less ascertainable law, should be the method of the Creator's self-revelation to His highest creatures, rather than those cataclysmic methods in which our ancestors believed. Those methods were in fact absolutely anthropomorphic : God was supposed to impart spiritual (and even scientific !) knowledge to man in the same way as I may impart the knowledge of Greek verbs to my son. The gradual rise of man's spiritual powers above this level, so that he strips his conceptions of God, one by one, of elements merely drawn from his own limited nature, is the evidence that he is truly alive in the highest part of his being. 'This is the Life Eternal, to be learning to know Thee' : *quem noscere*, not *quem nosse, vivere*. When therefore the study of comparative religion leads us to examine even the religion of the Bible by the help of scientific principles drawn from dispassionate investigation of 'heathenism' in its myriad forms, we are absolutely loyal to the first principles of Christianity itself. And if our inquiry brings us to describe the religion of Christ as the climax of an evolutionary process, and other religions, even the lowest, as lower rungs of the same ladder, we are only recognising the fact that God 'left not Himself without witness,' that He 'wills all men to be saved, and arrive at cognition of Truth.' If His plan proves more wide-reaching and more colossal than we dreamed, it will not lessen our sense of the unique majesty of the Man who united in Himself all the broken lights of God which mankind had realised, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, in the ages before He reached them.

Having thus tried to justify, from the Christian standpoint, the free and scientific examination of development in religion, Christian and non-Christian alike, we must preface our study of syncretism with an important caution. Nothing retards a really scientific progress more than the stupid assumption, still prevalent, that similarities in religions are necessarily evidence of conscious borrowing. We are very familiar with the kind of criticism which requires the presence in the Carpenter's shop at Nazareth of a well-thumbed set of Sacred Books of the East, in Aramaic or Greek, including by the way advance copies of sundry works which were not issued to the general public till several generations had gone by. Here, no doubt, 'apologetic bias' will be suspected in the scoffer's mind, and I must hasten to provide less tainted evidence. No more striking fact comes out from the reading of the *Golden Bough* than the regularity with which identical ideas, forms, and rites appear at different ages in widely distant parts of the world. Is totemism in the North American Indian and in the Australian savage to be explained by some prehistoric communication? It is hard enough for civilised minds to reduce this complex and difficult conception to any kind of order, and yet we are forced to believe that it is mere coincidence that it arises in so many parts of the world. Turn to the higher religions. Socrates and Zoroaster both reached a conception of a future life based on ethical standards. Had Socrates read the Gâthâs, or—if Darmesteter's paradox is to be followed—had the Parsi Chatterton read the *Phaedo* ? No one ever maintained the former ; and in maintaining something like the latter, Darmesteter stood in a splendid isolation which even his unrivalled greatness as an Orientalist has done nothing to modify. There is no conceivable reason why the recognition of coincidence in the sphere of the lower religions should be exchanged for an insatiable suspicion of borrowing as soon as we come to the higher. If little wits jump, why not great wits as well ? In the realms of intellectual discovery, we know how by sheer coincidence the same problem will present itself simultaneously to two men of genius, and be solved in much the same way. We do not think it necessary to hint that Darwin's papers had been secretly purloined by Wallace, or Adams's calculations put into the hands of Leverrier. Granted similar conditions, we expect to see similar products. It seems to follow that even remarkable similarities between one religion and another must not be set down to borrowing unless some stringent conditions are fulfilled. We must prove that the alleged borrower had been in close contact with holders of the creed from which he drew inspiration. It must be a sympathetic contact, at least at several points. And the borrowing even then can only be proved beyond question by fairly numerous coincidences of detail in comparatively trifling things ; for general agreement in great principles can be, and nearly always is, due to independent development.

We will dwell a little longer on this subject of borrowing, as we cannot deal with genuine syncretism until spurious examples are cleared away. In three great religions we find the common conception of a founder assailed by the devil at the outset of his life-work, and tempted to sin. The pictures of Buddha tempted by Mara, Zoroaster by Ahriman, and Jesus by Satan, present features which have led excellent authorities to jump at the idea of a historical connection. R. Seydel, in his monograph on the alleged borrowing of the Gospels from Buddhist legends (p. 13), gives a number of parallels in the Temptation story which seem remarkably close when so epitomised as to leave out the discordant context and preserve only the points of similarity. But when we bring in the third element, we find we can make out as good a case for Zoroastrian borrowing. In Fargard 19 of the Vendidad, the Parsi Leviticus, we read how Ahriman sent a demon to slay Zarathushtra, who was repelled by the recitation of a holy word of revelation; and how Ahriman himself then appealed to him to 'renounce the good Mazdean Law,' promising a boon 'such as Vadhaghana obtained,' the typical heretic king. It may be added that the scene is laid near the holy river Daityâ, which Zarathushtra worships, and that later embellishments expound Ahriman's promise as world-rule for a millennium, besides fixing the prophet's age as thirty, like that of Buddha when he began his work. Now contact between Buddhism and Parsism is not impossible. There is one presumably late Avestic passage which is most naturally explained as polemic against Brahmanism, and another against one Gaotema, who is best taken (with Haug, Darmesteter, and Jackson) as none other than Gautama himself. Nevertheless I cannot believe that Parsism here owes anything to India, even though community of race and comparative nearness of geographical position make the contact easy. The details are no more out of the way than those which are common to the Buddhist and the Gospel story. In religions which include within their creed a belief in evil spirits, there is surely nothing more obvious and inevitable than that the founder should be assailed by them at the outset of his career. If we are in the realm of history, well-nigh every religious originator in ancient or modern times has begun with this experience, and whether objective or subjective matters nothing for our purpose. And if—as is very obvious in the case of Zarathushtra—we are examining legendary accretions around a historical personality, an invention on these lines was absolutely natural. Even Hellenism, which had no devil, invented one for the occasion in the apologue of the Choice of Herakles. Had Prodicus been reading the *Jâtaka*? To be tempted with kingdoms is a natural experience for such imperially-minded men, and the age of thirty is the most suitable period for a great religious teacher to begin his work. So we might argue throughout the short tale of coincidences which are scattered among the far greater differences. If Parsism and Buddhism are independent here, much more is Christianity. The channel by which Buddhism might affect the Gospel narrative exists only in conjecture; and though Parsism has some points of contact with Judaism, as I have tried to show elsewhere,[1] the mere reading of the grotesque passage in the Vendidad would probably convince most first-hand inquirers, that this is not one of them.

One more instance of alleged borrowing I should like to refer to, because it will illustrate the indirect influence which one religion may have on another without any considerable transference of ideas. I have just alluded to the relations between Judaism and Parsism, which will form a transition to our study of religions in which heterogeneous elements are definitely fused. It is an acknowledged fact that after the Exile, in which the Jews came in contact with some form of Mazda-worship, and from which the head of that religion sent them home with grateful hearts to Jerusalem, the Jews developed (1) a belief in immortality; (2) an ordered and formal angelology and demonology. They 'brought the names of the angels from Babylon,' the Talmud says; and the Parsi system may well seem to account for the striking difference between earlier and later Hebrew conceptions as well as for the growth of the new doctrine of the future life. And yet the best authorities, both from the Parsi side and from different schools of Old Testament criticism, are agreeing to dismiss the thought of simple borrowing, except in comparative trifles. It is because in respect of great principles Judaism very clearly came to the same goal by a different road. In the mere naming and ranking of spirits good and bad the Jews might sometimes take a hint from the foreigner. But in a matter of importance, such as the development of the Satan, they could not borrow from Parsism, for Ahriman was utterly different from the Satan of Job, even if the Satan of the New Testament is not essentially different from him. So with the doctrine of the future life. The Psalms, which very rarely even seem to hint at immortality, show us decisively the circle of thoughts out of which the great hope was certain sooner or later to rise. We see the consciousness of the Real Presence becoming more and more intense in these hymns of the Jewish Church. And men to whom in this life God was so real and so near were not likely to go on very long without inference that such fellowship with an eternal God could not be terminated by death. In other words, the great idea, as set forth in the matchless poetry of the Book of Wisdom, unconsciously came into the Church's thought by the way indicated in our Lord's answer to the Sadducees. Between six and ten centuries earlier, Zarathushtra had preached the same truth to King Vishtâspa in Balkh. So far as I can see, the Gâthâs suggest that the thought of a theodicy was the basis of his conception, acting upon the predisposition which Aryan nature-worship had already created in those from whom he sprang. Had the fact that Cyrus believed in immortality anything to do then with the growth of that idea among the Jews whom he emancipated? I venture to think it had. Was it nothing to them to know that their Persian deliverers could see light where they saw nothing but the gloom of Sheol—Sheol where there was 'no remembrance' of God? Surely such knowledge must have been the spark that fired the train? The mere fact that others had attained the ἐλπὶς ἀθανασίας πλήρης was abundantly sufficient impulse to make such men take the short step into their 'inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away.'

---

[1] See 'Zoroastrianism' in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv.

We have now provided ourselves with cautions against assuming syncretism where none exists; and we have briefly sketched a typical instance of syncretism that goes no further than indirect influence. We pass on to consider the case in which religions call for a 'higher criticism,' to dissect out the elements that come from very different sources, blended together in what the people innocently suppose to be a solid and homogeneous system. In classifying the facts, we naturally begin with the religions which owe their essentials to a single founder. Syncretism has here a very large and almost wholly evil activity. When the impulse of the first enthusiasm has died down, the former beliefs of the people return, often transformed in name and appearance, to preserve the show of continuity. Reversion to type replaces evolutionary progress, and the only hope of advance is in a return to the first beginnings of the faith, from which subsequent development has been nothing but one long degeneration. Could Parsism get back to the purity of the Hymns of Zoroaster, or Buddhism recall the spirit of Sâkyamuni, what should we see but life from the dead? In all 'founded' religions it seems to be a natural law that the stream can never rise above the level of its source. There are other religions in which instead of one founder a series of prophets supply the impluse of progress: instead of a sudden upward movement which lifts men too high for them to breathe, we have a gradual advance, each pioneer rising above the level of his predecessors. Such was the development of the religion of Israel; and in many ways we see the same in Greece. Here the extent of degeneration naturally depends on the frequency with which the quickening impulses came. Under this heading we may class the missionary religions; for though missionaries are generally distinguished from the prophets of Israel, and the pioneer thinkers elsewhere whom we have classed with them, by the fact that they are propagandists of an existing system and not extenders of it, their activity is wholly prophetic in the character of the impulse they impart. An entirely different class of syncretism appears when a new religion is brought into a country by immigration or conquest, or by close contact with a neighbouring country. Here the phenomena in many respects are parallel with those we may observe in the spheres of language and of institutions. Mixture takes place, the predominance of one element or the other, depending on complicated conditions which vary with the particular circumstances.

We need not proceed further with the attempt to classify the principles of religious syncretism, but will briefly analyse some of their effects. I shall take Parsism as my main text, not only because it is more familiar ground to myself, but because it seems to be a peculiarly promising field for our inquiry. There are to be seen there (1) the elements due to a prophet founder; (2) the disguised features of an earlier nature-religion; (3) a ritual system imported by an alien priestly caste, and (4) survivals from primitive belief, adapted to the system of a higher religion. In stating this I have to assume as proved a few assertions, the arguments for which must be sought elsewhere. It is moreover necessary to warn those who would naturally go to the *Sacred Books of the East* for the text of the Avesta, and for an authoritative account of its history, that the introduction to the first volume, by James Darmesteter, presents a theory of origins which all its author's well-earned fame has not commended to other Iranian scholars. Taking Zarathushtra then as a historical character, and the Gâthâs as mainly proceeding from his hand, their date, the seventh century B.C. (the traditional date), or (as I think more probable) two or three centuries earlier, we can get a clear idea of the nature of the great reform. We have several sources for the portraiture of the religion Zarathushtra revolutionised. There is the extremely accurate description by Herodotus of an essentially identical system surviving among the Persian populace in his own day. There is the evidence afforded by the Rigveda, the oldest monument of a people very near of kin, itself written in a language closely allied with that of the Gâthâs. And we may perhaps add the evidence of Mithraism, the famous missionary religion which for generations proved by far the most serious rival to the early Christian Church: it is most naturally regarded, I think, as lineally descended from primitive Persian religion, untouched by the Zoroastrian reform. Like all the other Indo-Germans, they worshipped the Sky—*Dyaush*, *Ζεύς*, *Diespiter*—as supreme: Herodotus tells us how the Persians went to the mountain-tops to sacrifice to him. In the next place 'Sun, moon, earth, fire, water, winds,' were the people's gods. Neither images nor temples were used, nor were the sacrificing priests a hereditary caste. Mitra, genius of the Sun and lord of Truth, was leader among the *asuras*, the highest gods, who were, as Professor Macdonell says, 'conceived as mighty kings, drawn through the air in their war chariots by swift steeds, and in character benevolent, almost entirely free from guile and immoral traits.' From so high a level was Parsism raised yet higher by a great religious genius; and from this, through syncretism with the debased cults of the Dravidian population, Hinduism descended into the depths at which we see it to-day. Even this mere sketch of Indo-Iranian religion will show us that Zarathushtra, like all other founders, owed much to his environment. But the advance he made was an extraordinary one for so early a time. He cleared the conception of deity from elemental characteristics, and vetoed polytheism. In place of the primeval name *Dyaush*, which Herodotus may have heard in Persia, he coined (if my reading of the facts is right) the purely abstract title *Ahura Mazdâh*, ‘the Omniscient Spirit.’ He solved the problem of Evil by developing some elemental fiend of darkness or storm into the ‘Spirit of Enmity,’ *Angra Mainyu*—no dualistic conception, I may note, for he is destined to ultimate annihilation. To supersede the other *asuras* (*ahuras*), Zarathushtra set next the supreme throne six archangels (*Amesha spenta*, ‘immortal holy ones’), whose names, like those of the Supreme Being and his antagonist, are those of pure abstractions. As we should expect, the attempt to destroy an ancient polytheism by mere silence, and the preaching of spiritual conceptions far above the people's understanding, did not long survive its author. Nominally monotheistic the religion remained, and remains to this day. But the old nature powers are back again as angels before the disappearance of the archaic dialect in which Zarathushtra preached and sang. Europe is able to show us how little need there is for a polytheistic nature-worship to sacrifice its cultus at the bidding of monotheism: call the old gods ‘adorable ones’ (*yazata*) or ‘spirits of the pious’ (*ashaonam fravashayō*)—‘angels’ or ‘saints,’ in Christian phraseology—and everything may go on as before. In the Avestan hymn to Anâhitā (‘the Undefiled’), our Lady of the Waters, we are told how her father Ahura Mazdâh sacrificed to her and prayed for a boon. *The Glories of Mary* could hardly match this. Throughout the second stratum of the Avesta we find the Yazatas in turn adored with a virtually henotheistic worship: the only difference between these hymns (*Yashts*) and those of the Veda being that though the subject of each hymn fills the horizon, there is frequent reference to one divinity who is recognised as supreme. The third stage in the religion comes with the appearance of the Magi. Herodotus tells us that they formed one of the six tribes of the Medes; and as one other tribe was called ‘Ἀριζαντοί,’ of Aryan race, it seems to follow that the Magi were not Aryan. They made an attempt to seize political supremacy at the death of

Cambyses; and after their short usurpation was defeated they seem to have set themselves to gain spiritual power instead. The rise of a sacred clan to the position of exclusive priests in a religion which formerly knew no restrictions is familiar to us from the examples of the Aaronic house in Israel, and of the Brahmans in India.

Dr. J. G. Frazer gives us closer parallels from a lower stage of civilisation, in which an aboriginal tribe is employed by conquering immigrants for priestly and magic functions, through fear of the occult powers its members are supposed to possess. Something of this kind may have given the Magi their chance. Gradually gaining sacerdotal power, soonest perhaps among the non-Aryan population, they brought their own ritual with them, and ultimately enchained Parsism in a yoke of bondage quite unmatched in civilised religions. They did not wholly get their way. They seem to have introduced the aboriginal method of disposing of the dead, familiar to us from descriptions of the 'Towers of Silence' in Bombay. But they preached in vain the unparalleled religious merit of incestuous marriages, the other conspicuous feature which classical antiquity observed in the Magi. The Avesta moreover both excludes their name—a single passage proves the rule by the exception—and bans the 'magic' which got its designation from them. The star lore and oneiromancy which are conspicuous in the Gospel story may be set by the Median folk-tale which underlies the Book of Tobit, and the solitary allusion in Ezekiel (viii. 16 f.), to give us indications of Magianism as distinct from the religion of Zoroaster. The fourth element in Parsism must be illustrated only with one example. The study of the religion of savages shows us that all the higher religions have retained traces of prehistoric stages of evolution, like the functionally useless survivals which anatomists tell us may be found in our bodies. This last analogy, however, only answers for survivals which have become mere folk-customs, destitute of religious meaning, like the Maypole ceremonial in England. In other cases the primitive idea or rite is taken up by the new religion and adapted to its own purposes. This is exemplified by the rite of circumcision and the taboos on unclean meats in the religion of Israel ; by the date and usages of Christmas in our modern Christianity, and probably by the practice of fasting communion in the ‘ Catholic ’ section of it. There is a very widespread primitive belief known as the doctrine of the External Soul. In popular *Märchen* we know the ogre who cannot be killed unless some object at an immense distance, surrounded by impossibilities of access, can be destroyed : Grimm's Tales will furnish plenty of instances to those who seek. The brand on which Meleager's life depended is a familiar example from classical mythology. It seems that in the Magian stratum of Parsism this primitive notion was developed into a sort of psychological theory, by which a man's identity included a part that always dwelt with Ormazd, and was only united with the soul at death. It was not a guardian angel, for it exercised no functions of guardianship : it simply shared the life of the man, and was affected by his good or evil behaviour. The conception itself as we have it is syncretic to a perplexing degree, and I must premise that throughout I am giving my own reading of the facts. The name, *fravashi*, which in our Avesta is given to these spirits, is due to the pre-Zoroastrian religion of Iran, already described ; and from this source may come some elements which the fravashis have in common with the Vedic *Pitâras*, ‘ Fathers,’ who are simply the ἥρωες, the spirits of the dead. From this source probably arises the interesting restriction by which the fravashi only belongs to a good man : *de mortuis nil nisi bonum* is a wise motto for people who think the dead have indefinite power to harm. Most of the attributes of the fravashis may come from this stratum—for example, their activities in promoting birth are paralleled by similar functions assigned to ancestor spirits among the Australian aborigines. But their most characteristic feature, that of the representative spirit, the heavenly counterpart of the good Mazda-worshipper, and even (though rarely) of a whole community, is due I think to the Magi alone, who seem, however, to have failed in an effort to identify these spirits more closely with the stars. To us the special interest of this element in Parsism comes in when we proceed to trace the idea beyond the borders of this creed.

It is generally recognised now that the Angels of the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse are strictly *representative* spirits, whose character and condition perpetually vary with those of the community which they reflect. I feel convinced that this conception is not native to Judaism or Christianity, but springs consciously or unconsciously from Parsism. And when we find our Lord Himself endorsing the belief, in telling us that the ‘ angels of the little ones ’—the heavenly ‘ doubles ’ of those who have not yet learned to sin—are always nearest to the Throne, we have a profoundly important illustration of the fact that Revelation may come by channels which we should hardly have been ready to recognise. The grounds of my theory I cannot state here, and of course I do not for a moment put it forward as anything but a hypothetical account.

I should have liked to pursue the subject of syncretism in religion beyond these limits into two or three other representative religions of the ancient world, and to have discussed especially the nature of survivals from primitive religion which are embedded in the theory or practice of all the higher products of religious evolution. But time forbids, though each new field introduces fresh principles, or fresh applications of principles already attained. My friend, Professor Ridgeway’s fascinating theory of syncretism in Hellas, when applied to Hellenic religion, yields some peculiarly interesting results, and is of special importance as illustrating what happens when very different races blend. As independently set forth in Dr. Jane Harrison's *Prolegomena*, we learn to trace to distinct racial strata the cult of the Olympians, with the cheerful views of the hereafter, peopled by heroes whose souls passed from the funeral pyre to the Islands of the Blest, and the gloomy Chthonian worship of the dead, haunting perpetually the soil in which their unburnt bodies lay, and powerful to help or harm their descendants whose one religious concern was to propitiate their favour. The medley of inconsistent beliefs that resulted will continue to supply subjects for extremely complex and important investigation. Turning to Rome, we should trace syncretism of a very different kind, and religion uniquely full of ritual survivals from the very lowest stages of development; among which the classical example of the *Golden Bough* provides in Dr. Frazer's epoch-making volumes a study that goes to the very root of our science of comparative religion. We should see there likewise how for purely literary purposes a people which had a ritual but no gods worthy of the name, could borrow a whole mythology from a race intellectually and spiritually superior—could indeed harbour cheerfully any foreign cult which afforded some relief from the dull and uninspiring monotony of the religion inherited from the distant past. The application of the whole study—pursued through many other fields as rich as these—would give us insight into the history of our own faith, which does not prove less divine because we may believe ourselves able to trace some of the lines of a development according to law. For we shall see that the elements of cultus and doctrine which can thus be traced back to their beginnings, belong after all to the 'means of grace,' to the channels of revelation. What matters it that the road is devious, if it leads to the goal? Comparative religion is always showing us that thoughts of God are developed in strict accord with the powers of those who conceive them, developed in many strangely different ways. The ultimate and absolute religion is reached when the means of grace are superseded by the grace itself, the infinite varieties of ritual service by the 'pure worship and undefiled before our God and Father,' the multiplicity of complex dogmas by the one all-comprehensive teaching, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and mind and strength, and thy neighbour as thyself.'

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER RELIGIONS

THE subject to-night is a sufficiently large one, and you will not expect exhaustive treatment. I only propose to-night to go over the ground in a casual way, trying to get hold of some of the principles, and, as far as possible, to represent what I take to be the modern, present-day view that Christians hold with regard to the problem of the world's religions and our relation to them. Our attitude to the other religions of the world has altered enormously within the last couple of generations. From one point of view, the starting-point has been the great impetus that was given to all thought rather more than fifty years ago by Charles Darwin. It was, of course, Biology only with which Darwin himself was concerned ; and when he brought out his great book he can have realised very little how far his discovery would lead. He was, shall I say, far too good a Cambridge man to overstep the limit of the sciences which he had made his own and pretend to deal with departments of knowledge of which he knew, as a matter of fact, nothing at all. The scientific spirit came first into sciences concerned with inanimate matter and animal life. Gradually men came to realise that we must expect to find everywhere the Reign of Law, an ordered sequence of cause and effect. In a widening circle of phenomena men learnt to trace this law of sequence, and deduce effects from cause.

That kind of spirit was bound to affect ultimately those studies which are concerned with the actions and thoughts of man. Take, for example, the department of language, now a recognised field of strictly scientific investigation. We have been learning within the last thirty or forty years to treat human speech as something which has its own fixed laws; and we expect to find those laws kept without exception. Nor are we disappointed, as far as the mechanical side of language is concerned. But the presence of a new factor, the elusive and largely incalculable factor of the action of conscious human will, complicates our problem, and makes law a principle in which we still believe, but often without any possibility of formulating it so as to predict effects from causes too intricate to be comprehensibly known. What we find in the science of language is found also in a whole series of sciences concerned with the manifold life and work of humanity. History, psychology, ethics, politics, and sociology are all being pursued to-day in a spirit profoundly influenced by the new temper depending largely upon those principles which Charles Darwin's fertile thought produced for the first time only fifty years ago.

It is inevitable, therefore, that there should arise from science an impulse forbidding us to exclude religion from the operation of law—by which, of course, we mean only the formulation of what we can understand of the principles by which God is pleased to act. This involves in the first place the industrious, impartial, and exhaustive collection of all facts connected with religion. Necessarily, therefore, in order to understand the laws of human development on all sides, the patient students of a new science have made it their duty to gather together and classify even the puerile superstitions of the most degraded savages, as well as the religious ideas of higher races. One typical pioneer I may name in connection with this new study; and you will forgive my pride in claiming this great name also for Darwin's University. Professor J. G. Frazer's famous work, the *Golden Bough*, stands out above all others in the same field by the encyclopædic quality of its record of facts and the scientific system of their presentation. Its influence upon present-day thought has been profound; and the indirect results have been felt in the market-place almost as much as in the study. Many have confidently asserted that the *Golden Bough* is destined to overthrow belief in religion altogether. I shall soon be quoting words by the author himself which will give a rather different impression. Meanwhile I will only say that I myself took—before it was offered—the advice of a well-known journalist who proclaimed the reading of that monumental work essential for the formation of sound views of religion and the history of religion. From this reading, and still more from my personal touch with the author (humblest, sincerest, and most faithful among seekers after truth), I have myself returned with a deeper and more satisfying view of the dealings of God with man than I ever had before. I cannot believe that, as Christians, we have any reason whatever to be afraid of the results of the *Golden Bough* any more than of *The Origin of Species*, as we all now acknowledge after a generation has passed away. The science of religion is not destined to destroy religion or reduce the evidence on which impartial and earnest thinkers can still recognise in it the Finger of God.

And then, on the other side, there has been a great change in the view that Christianity has taken of other religions. There was a time when Christian missionaries used to come back to this country and describe on the missionary platform the strange superstitions of the people to whom they went, and the general idea was, I take it, that those things were symbolic of the darkness in which these people were everywhere hidden, and of the urgent call to Christians to go and bring them light. I do not mean, of course, to suggest that that has passed away from our missionary meetings; indeed, it cannot possibly pass away. But the idea that these notions were worth studying for themselves, and that they had some kind of reason behind them, even though it was a very strange reason, had never dawned upon our ancestors. To-day, in most of these heroic men and women who go into the dark parts of the world in order to bring the illuminating ministry of the Gospel of Christ, we can recognise a sympathetic outlook upon these various religions, and a resolute determination to discover everything that is good and helpful, every seed of truth which can be made to grow. We can see, in reading the minds of our missionaries, their recognition that even in the most rudimentary and repulsive ideas of peoples throughout the world who are still in the childhood stage, there are, after all, some traces of the great fact that men are born 'to seek God, if haply they might grope after Him and find Him'—or, to turn from St. Paul to Homer, that 'all men long for the Divine.'

Now there is, I take it, a great difference between the old view of non-Christian religions and the new view. The old view was, in its essence, that there was one true religion in the world, and a great many false ones. That was carried to an extraordinary extent in ancient times when the Fathers of the Church used to declare, as we remember, that the virtues of the heathen were merely 'shining vices.' But now, as we read the story of the great men of the past, we praise God's Holy Name for His servants long ago departed this life in His faith and fear. Though they knew not the very name of Christ, we believe that they were truly in His army, engaged in His work, and bravely doing God's will in the world for the age in which they were born. We think of Socrates drinking the hemlock in serene confidence, and with his last breath ordering a special thanksgiving to the Healer God, because 'after life's fitful fever' he was about to 'sleep well.' And we think of less well-known examples. Perhaps many of us here may have read a very striking article by Professor Harnack, of Berlin, in the *Hibbert Journal* for October 1911. It was about the religion of the philosopher Porphyry, known as one of the most vehement of the early opponents of Christianity, a man who spent his life in controversy, and had nothing but contempt and hatred and invective for the Christian religion. And yet even that man, when once he could forget controversy in writing to his wife, whom he dearly loved, to give her the results of his own independent thought about religion, declared that man's highest task is to know God ; that only the eternal is valuable ; that sin is the worst of all evils ; that knowledge and purity of soul are the highest good ; and that only by living with God may we attain good, and eternal life. It is hard indeed to see anything there that his Christian opponents might not have accepted joyfully, and claimed their great enemy as in part possessing what one of them called *anima naturaliter Christiana*, 'a spirit by nature Christian.'

So from ancient history we pass to the non-Christian lands of to-day. We think, first and foremost, of India, the land for which we British are so specially responsible. You will remember that beautiful story by Mr. Rudyard Kipling in the *Second Jungle Book*, 'the Miracle of Purun Das.' That story is fiction ; but sometimes truth is found in fiction just as much as it is in fact, and I think those who know India best would say that the story is wholly true to life. I could put by it a true story which I have heard from Dr. Henry Haigh, one of the most distinguished of our Wesleyan missionaries. He tells how one day he went into a temple in South India and there found a Fakir who for fourteen years had held his hand above his head : long ago the muscles had stiffened, and he could not bring it down. The missionary went up to him and asked him why had he done it ; and he said, 'Sir, fourteen years ago I sinned with that hand, and I lifted it to Heaven so that I may have forgiveness.' We could gather from all countries, though from none perhaps as abundantly as from India, corresponding evidence to show how earnestly men whom we call heathens will sometimes seek after God. I should have liked to pass on to other great religious systems and show how warmly we can welcome all signs of true if partial illumination that we may find in every part of the world. Especially should I gladly dwell on the renunciation of Gautama, the Buddha, and even more gladly on the great, dim figure of a prophet whom we cannot even date, Zarathushtra or Zoroaster, the prophet of the Parsis. The lofty thoughts, the pure views of God, which are to be found in his difficult and obscure verse remind us how men have in all periods proved that those who earnestly seek God will surely find Him.

Now in all this I want you to realise that I am not speaking merely as a theorist from his armchair at home. Such can easily give away the case of the missionaries who are at grips with things that are most evil. The missionaries might not be very pleased with the easy-going tolerance of men who have never been in the midst of the evil things which they have to see every day. I am speaking in what I know to be the prevailing spirit of Christian ministers and foreign missionaries to-day. My reason for saying this is, especially, that I had a privilege, which no one who shared it is likely to forget throughout his lifetime, of being present at the great World Conference that met in Edinburgh in the summer of 1910. It was a gathering of twelve hundred delegates, a very large proportion of them actually missionaries who had spent a large part of their lives in the foreign field. But the Conference did not only consist of delegates who were there. We heard silent voices from a much larger company. Through two years before the Conference an immense mass of testimony had been collected from missionaries in every part of the non-Christian world. It had been carefully examined and summarised with admirable skill; and preparatory reports were based upon it by representative committees whose judgment came to us with the weight of wide experience and earnest thought. You may read these reports for yourselves, and there is not much serious literature that is better worth reading. You will find in them the quintessence of the spirit of the modern missionary.

He goes out because he knows that, after all, there is some light among those whom he goes to evangelise; because he believes in 'the Light that lighteth every man, coming into the world'; and his object is not to stamp out the 'dimly burning wick,' or to 'crush the broken reed.' He goes to strengthen that which is weak, to fan the flickering spark into a flame, to bring to every religion that which will not destroy it but fulfil to the utmost all its possibilities of good. In this, the manifest purpose of the modern missionary, assuredly he can claim that he has the example of the earliest of all missionaries before him. It is not a new discovery, forcing us to apologise for the New Testament, and say that it was written in a dark age, which we have long ago left behind. On the contrary, this new spirit is only one more example of the most shining characteristic of that Book of books. We can go on voyages of discovery still in its well-worn pages, and find deep places there that we never tried to fathom. We discover now that this attitude towards Christ's 'other sheep' was in the Gospel already—only we never saw it. We study that mighty genius, the greatest missionary of all time. How full of sympathy was Paul! Sir William Ramsay has well pointed out the implications of his manifest enthusiasm for the Greek games, from which gatherings he draws his images so constantly; yet they were inseparably bound up with Greek religion. Look at the words Luke reports him as speaking at Athens. How he gets hold of words from the great Greek poets and thinkers! We have had an addition to these words discovered within recent years by Dr. Rendel Harris; and we know that the great phrase, 'In Him we live and move and have our being,' is not Paul's coinage, but a quotation by him from a Greek thinker, Epimenides, who lived some six centuries before him. There is that other word, spoken by at least two of the poets of Greece, 'We also are His offspring.' And when he rejects the idea that God could 'have need of us,' he was, as Lucretius shows us, gathering truth even from Epicurean teaching. So Paul was able to seize upon all that was good in the beliefs of those to whom he spoke, magnifying it, making the most of it, and reminding his hearers that just because of these truths of which they themselves knew, they ought to be sympathetic when he came to speak to them of something which was brighter and better and fuller still. Even when he went to people like those of Lystra, whose religion was rudimentary, he had the same kind of thing to say. When the men of Lystra tried to worship him and Barnabas, believing that once more, as in their own folklore story, the gods had come down from heaven in the likeness of men, he had the same message for them. He reminded them that God had not 'left Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave them from heaven rain and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness.' It may startle us at first to remember that the ancestors of these people, and no doubt they themselves, could only interpret such words in what seems to us a very childish way. They worshipped the sky-god because he gave them rain; and they worshipped the tree because the tree bore them fruit. But Paul knew perfectly well that such people could not possibly have risen at once to the full height of Jewish monotheism. He could only accept their rudimentary faith as an evidence of something that he could believe to be a germ of true religion, which he might endeavour to develop into something higher.

In dealing with this subject to-day we have to begin with that which comes before the Christian religion. We may never forget that Christianity was the completion, the fulfilment, the perfect flower and fruit of the great religion which had existed before its time. Let me try to describe our attitude towards the faith of Israel. There was a time when people seemed to think that this was as perfect at the very first as at the end. But the comparative science of religion is now teaching us the fact that the faith of Israel was evolved from very simple and rudimentary beginnings up to the point which it reaches at the end of the Old Testament. We need not to be afraid of seeking the beginnings of Judaism among conditions which are very like those of other nations' religions. Nay, the more we recognise that, the higher will be our tribute to the religious genius of the little nation through which it was God's will to give the world His most perfect revelation. We need not begin to ask what the first conception of the God of Israel was; whether Jehovah was a God of volcano, of storm or of lightning, or whatever else it may have been. The point is, having got an idea of God which gave a notion of His greatness and power and awful unapproachable majesty, that one tribe, which first began to appreciate thus the truth of God, developed the thought, unconsciously and gradually, through its possession of a body of men unparalleled in human history, a series of prophets. What are prophets? We know what inventors are in the material world, men who can wring from nature secrets that are of value for human life, or devise mechanical contrivances that indefinitely add to our comfort. We know also what poets are, and philosophers, men who seize great ideas and put them in imperishable words for their countrymen and posterity to read and think about, and be elevated by the reading of them. And what the inventor is in the material world, and the poet and the philosopher in the world of thought, that the prophet is in the world of religion. He is a great inventor, who has a vision that does not come to other men.

Now prophets are not by any means restricted to the people of Israel. There are prophets all through the world; there have been prophets in all religions. The great difference between Israel and other nations is that the prophets of Israel—putting aside even the quality of their intuitions—were more numerous and continuous, each one going a step beyond the other. Instead of simply having one great man who passed away and left no successors behind, as many another religion has had, they had a succession which went on without break until at last the religion reached the wonderful heights which it is seen to occupy in the books of the Old Testament prophets. Having thus produced a religion which was full of ethical ideas, a religion that was closely connected with conduct, and characteristically endowed with gifts capable of bettering the world, it went forth to its supreme task, as we Christians declare, in the perfected work of Jesus Christ. Let us try to realise why that little people of Israel has done such a work in the world. We are no longer able to say that they were special favourites of God, as sometimes they themselves imagined, that they monopolised the divine favour, that the rest of the world had to subsist on uncovenanted mercies while the children of Israel alone in the whole world were the people of God. But we can say that the people of Israel had a genius for religion which far surpassed that of any other race. Compare first the Greeks. Greek thinkers and poets reached astonishing heights in religious speculation and ethical theory. But as soon as you study them you realise that it is the intellect which stands first. It was the winning of the realm of thought which was especially the province of that marvellous people, the most gifted people in all the world's history, for all the prizes of intellect seem to be theirs. Art, poetry, science, and everything that the human mind is capable of achieving, all seem to start from that one little people. But even they never learned to connect religion with conduct as the Jews instinctively did. And religion that is even partially divorced from conduct is a tree that bears no fruit.

Let us go over to India. Now the people of India are naturally and essentially religious. We welcome the evidence of that with all our hearts; there can be no doubt about it. But what do we see there? We see an unpractical mysticism which would make

India quite unfit for carrying the message of a perfect religion to the whole world. We come back again to the Jews to recognise that they were able to fulfil the words of their own psalm: 'Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast received gifts for men.' For must we not recognise that every nation has its own special genius, its own special gift, and that that gift was never intended for the nation to enjoy for itself alone? Nations or individuals, we hold our gifts only on condition of realising that they are ours simply in order that we may pass them on.

And that, then, is the preparation of Christianity. The Jews, with their pure and elevated monotheism, had prepared a race of intensely eager and religious souls who were waiting for the consummation of all the nation's hopes in the Messiah whom they were expecting. When at last He came, there was an audience ready for Him; there were enthusiastic disciples who were able to listen to His voice and to take His lofty standards as their law. The providential reason why this perfect Man, whom we Christians believe to be something more, did not go to Greece or to India was that in Palestine He would find the most complete preparation for Him, and the best equipped missionaries to realise His message and take that message to the world. The great apostle of the Gentiles, wherever he went, went first to the synagogue. It was not only because of his intense love for his own people. In the synagogue he would find those who were readiest to do a work like his own. His mission was complete if he only made a few converts, and every one of these converts was a missionary. To make missionaries he went from city to city, and Christianity passed like a flame over the ancient world, until at last when the Roman Empire awoke to its danger the work was done too thoroughly to be undone again.

I pass on, then, to a word of comparison. I think I have said enough to show that if I do contrast

Christianity with other religions it is from a deeply sympathetic point of view, that of one who is eager to see every glint of light that there is, even in the meanest and lowest and most degraded of religions. When we begin to compare with its rivals the creed which now may be said to claim the nominal allegiance of one-third of mankind, we ask what is the test whereby we are to weigh one against another. Is not the most essential test found in watching the effectiveness of the protest that a religion makes against every kind of wrong and anti-social conduct? A religion is to be regarded as good which makes a peremptory and unambiguous claim for purity, loftiness, and unselfishness of life; and that one is highest of all which proves in effect to be the most powerful in inducing men to forget themselves and live for their fellow-men. Now, of course, if that is going to be the test by which we are to compare Christianity with other religions, there will be an instant retort, 'But has not Christendom itself been guilty of appalling crimes?' Most assuredly it has. In the name of Christ, one shudders to think, even His own countrymen, the Jews, are at this present day, in many parts of Europe, being treated with fiendish barbarity. We think of the hideous history of what was called the Holy Inquisition, a memory of cruelty surpassing perhaps anything in human history. And that, likewise, was exercised by those who professed to be followers of Jesus Christ, and to be doing all these diabolical deeds in order to keep His religion pure. We think of the wars that have been waged in the name of Christ. We think of slavery, supported by many within our own time by arguments ingeniously drawn from this very Bible which is the charter of human liberty. We think of the many things which are still permitted by the conscience of our modern Christian world here in England. We blush as we think of these things, and men demand how we can claim that Christianity stands in the forefront of religions for its power in making men live a life of unselfish love. Yes, but for all that, when you come to think of it, every revolt against these evil things has found its motive force in the New Testament, and that which has come therefrom. You must remember that in order to judge Christianity you must not take simply its lower products, you must go to the highest products. You should judge every religion in the first place by the best that it can produce and not by the worst. And, moreover, if you want to judge a religion, obviously the only fair thing to do is to go straight to its own authoritative documents, to the person and work of its founder, and from that to form your view of its real qualities. As soon as you look at that, you realise that all these things of which I have been speaking have been done in spite of Christianity and not because of it. That has been one of the most sorrowful facts in history. Most assuredly, never could any one of them be justified for one instant from the New Testament; and we are finding out, generation after generation, how implicitly in that New Testament there are truths we never thought of until they were pointed out to us by some prophet-voice that sent us back to our own Book and told us what was there. There in that New Testament, surely, there are words which make war, for example, most fearful of all the wrongs that are done to God by being done to His creatures and His children. I should be sorry to have to find a text in the New Testament for a 'patriotic' sermon about some victory won by our nation. May God preserve us from ever winning another victory! It is superfluous to add, or suffering a defeat.

We turn to other religions. What do we find there? The protest against anti-social behaviour is absent, or something worse than absent, in reference to large departments of conduct, even where it is effective on one or two sides. In the sacred books of all the religions of the world we find some blots which are grievous indeed. We know very well where to find them in

Greek religion. You remember how Socrates was hampered in his ethical teaching by ugly stories about the gods; how Euripides had to declare boldly that 'if the gods do something disgraceful they are no gods at all'; and he was thought an atheist for saying so. The Greek religion with all its perfection and beauty of thought was not able to drive out of its history things that were a disgrace and a shame. The very Father of the Gods himself was described in well-known stories as coming down to low amours with mortals. How could men have respect for the principles of morality, when their very gods led them astray?

And if we go to India, which I have spoken of as a country that has so many of the true fruits of religion, what do we find there? Do you realise that in the Indian penal code there is a special provision that indecent art is to be punished and banned *except* when it is connected with worship. Those who know India tell us that in the sculptures on some of its most famous temples are 'things which it is even a shame to speak of.'

I might go round many religions in this manner, but this is not the most essential thought I want to present to you to-night. I might ask you further, in comparing Christianity and other religions, to remember that it is possible for us to make a comparison of sacred literatures, and to make it in a way which rules out any possible denial. You have your fifty volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East*, initiated by Max Müller, and published by Oxford University. You find the best of them takes a great deal of reading. There is much chaff and little grain in very many of them. And then you put against them the Christian Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, and you turn to the record of your British and Foreign Bible Society, to apply a very simple criterion. You will find that there is only one book in the world that has been translated into one-tenth as many languages as the Christian

Scriptures, or parts of them. What do you think that book is? Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, which is, I believe, the only book to speak in more than a hundred languages, except the Gospels, which cover the whole world. You will not wonder at the contrast when you have read their rivals.

And when you go further and ask not simply how many translations there are, but what the results of them have been, you will see that the comparison is easy indeed. The same is true about religious thought. Turning from religious practice to religious thought, you find pure and permanent elements in all religions one after another, as I have been saying already. But do you ever find that another religion has got hold of a beautiful and living thought of God which is not to be found in Christianity? Never.

In the report of Commission IV. of the Edinburgh Conference, on the Missionary Message, you will find evidence for this thesis, that whereas frequently non-Christian religions have led the most thoughtful missionaries to make a definite change in their ideas of Christianity, that change has always been in the direction of bringing them back to the New Testament, to find something there which even they had not adequately realised before. There are sundry applications of this. For example, the missionaries to Islam tell us that there is a considerable obstacle to their work in the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is commonly taught among Western people. But what does that mean? Does it mean there is a suggestion that the doctrine of the Trinity ought to be given up for fear of offending the Moslems? Not at all. The result of the experience of those missionaries is simply that the doctrine has been carelessly and imperfectly stated by a number of Christian thinkers, who did not think deeply enough. What is wanted is not to give up the doctrine, but only to go back to the New Testament and put it in a way which is closer to the original. And so I might go on with other doctrines. I was thinking of two others, but my time has gone. I remind you that the one thing that we can claim beyond all question is that the strong points of each successive religion throughout the whole world are found to be there in our own New Testament, and most of them very strongly prepared for in the Old. We find them there already: we have nothing new to add.

And so I claim to-night that Christ comes essentially to set men free. There is thought in our midst which claims to be freethought. I claim that Christ is the supreme 'Freethinker,' and those who follow Him are freethinkers in fact; the others are freethinkers only in name. What is it that is going to set men free? Only something that is powerful enough fundamentally to change the evil that we recognise to be in us, those things which drag us down; and no intellect, unaided, will ever raise us. Greece itself, for example, is discovered to have barbaric ideas in its religion, and to keep them throughout all those periods of the highest intellectual vigour. I hope that some who are in this room to-night have been listening to the extraordinarily interesting and informing lectures of my friend the Rev. John Roscoe, at the University—the last of them is being given at this moment. Mr. Roscoe was a pioneer missionary in Uganda, and the mission work there has illustrated in thirty-two years this very thing. When he went there some twenty-five years ago, there were practices among the people of Uganda which have startled some of us as we heard them described, because they were exactly like familiar usages in the religions of Greece and Rome. Strange, childish, superstitions as they seem to us, there they were among those intellectual peoples; there they were among the people of Uganda. But one generation of Christianity has cleared them all away. Only one-third of the Uganda are not Christians. Many of these are Moslems, and in the out-of-the-way places there are still a few heathen. Thus, in one generation, you have a Christianised people, so completely Christianised that they have become a missionary church, training their own teachers, supporting them, and sending them forth to bring to their neighbours the good news which has emancipated them. I take that as one example. I need hardly say that it would be possible to go on till midnight simply mentioning the names of the triumphs of missionary work in the world. Throughout the non-Christian world men are found living in the most dire condition of fear. Men are in terror of the ghosts that are about them, the spirits of their ancestors, which, unless they were got to slumber, would bring all manner of evil upon the living. Everywhere, wherever we look, as we read the pages of the *Golden Bough*, our thought is that of Rome's great rationalist poet, 'So much of ill has been prompted by religion.' Yes, it is a sad side that; though, perhaps, as we study more deeply, we find that there have been some compensations in the long process which has brought men up from the very depths. Fear—the 'fear which hath torment'—has now been exorcised by the coming of Christ, and that coming has brought peace to men of all races and conditions. He has come to peoples full of intellect and skill and thought, such as the scholars of India and China. The learned contemplative man has yielded to the spell of Christ; and at the other end of creation the lowest and meanest cannibals have heard His voice. In the Free Trade Hall three or four years ago you might have heard the voice of that brave missionary, Dr. George Brown, whose life Robert Louis Stevenson wanted to write. He told, so modestly, his story about his work among the most savage cannibals of the Southern Seas; how an experienced Christian man, the British Governor, warned him that if he was not extremely careful he would not come back alive; and how, in the short space of seven years, such a change was wrought, that that very Governor, on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, visited that shore and was greeted by a native choir singing 'God Save the Queen' in English. That is the kind of work which Christianity can do in the world to-day. I began with the great name of Charles Darwin. Let me close with it, and remind you that he—a witness, surely, whom even the stoutest rationalist must listen to—saw in South America wild savages whom he declared nothing on earth could ever tame; and then he heard, to his amazement, that a Christian missionary had been among them, and that the impossible had been actually achieved, as it has been achieved so many times in the history of mankind. Darwin himself became a subscriber to the Missionary Society which sent that man out, to the end of his life. Is not that witness enough to the extraordinary and unique power of our religion in winning men to a higher and better life?

I would quote to you in closing words of that other great man of science of our own time, which will remind you what is the view that is held by some of the greatest intellects, absolutely impartial in this regard, with regard to that Book which the Bible Societies and the Christian missionaries are trying to take to the ends of the world. These are the words of Professor J. G. Frazer, the author of the *Golden Bough*: 'The reading of the Bible breaks into the dull round of common life like a shaft of sunlight on a cloudy day, or a strain of solemn music heard in a mean street. It seems to lift us for a while out of ourselves, our little cares and little sorrows, into communion with those higher powers, whatever they are, which existed before man began to be, and which will exist when the whole human race, as we are daily reminded by the cataclysms and convulsions of nature, shall be swept out of existence for ever. It strengthens in us the blind conviction, or the trembling hope, that somewhere, beyond these earthly shadows, there is a world of light eternal, where the obstinate questionings of the mind will be answered and the heart find rest.' There is indeed impressive testimony to the Book of which we declare that He who is the supreme subject of it gathers up all truth, raises it to its highest and most perfect form, inculcates in the mind of man the deepest and most lasting love for his fellow-men, and in this way brings to pass His own word when He declared that He 'came not to destroy but to fulfil.'

THE WORD AND THE WORLD

THE completion of the monumental *Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles* marks an epoch in the development of Christian apologetics. No such application is directly suggested in the 1750 pages of closely printed bibliography which is all that the undiscerning eye will note in these three magnificent volumes. A solitary sentence in Mr. Darlow's preface tells us the thought that was probably uppermost in the minds of himself and his colleague, Mr. H. F. Moule, throughout the long years' toil that have issued in this book. We cannot open our review more fittingly than by quoting the short and restrained paragraph in which the aim is stated:

> The Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society entrusted us with this work as a contribution towards the fulfilment of the Society's aim and object. It provides a conspectus of what has been otherwise achieved in one great field of Christian enterprise. In another aspect the *Catalogue* constitutes a chapter in the ever-expanding volume of Christian evidences. It supplies an abstract and brief chronicle of the way in which the Bible can subdue to its service the manifold forms of human speech. We venture to hope that the work will also assist and encourage new translators and revisers of Holy Scripture in their endeavours 'to undo the curse of Babel and to carry out the blessing of Pentecost.'

To expand the significance of that brief statement, and show the relation of the *Catalogue* to the object of the *International Review of Missions* will be the purpose of the present paper.

Some sixty or seventy titles catalogued here are versions in obsolete languages, or belong to a category of which Prince L. L. Bonaparte's series forms the main part, being printed for purely philological purposes. Setting these aside, we find that the *Catalogue* describes editions of the whole Bible, or parts of it, in considerably over five hundred distinct dialects. About ten years ago Mr. Darlow himself made some researches as to the total number of languages in which other books have appeared. It might really seem no unfit enterprise for the Bible Society if the skill and industry now released by the publication of the *Catalogue* were directed to the preparation of a companion volume, a bibliography of the world's literary and scientific classics as published in other languages than their own. The comparison would be so eloquent that the enterprise may be seriously suggested to the committee, at any rate for a time when the Society can find no more languages in which the whole Bible is not printed, and no versions which cannot be materially improved! The condition, it must be admitted, renders it difficult to hope that these admirable editors will be available for the task. Mr. Ritson tells us there are still more than a thousand dialects in which there is not even one Gospel. Pending the appearance of so significant an appendix, we may note meanwhile some typical totals that might figure therein. The *Iliad* is known to have been published in over twenty of the leading languages of Europe; and the Shakespeare Memorial Library at Birmingham contains evidence that the master poet of the only literature that can rival the Greek may be read in at least twenty-seven languages. The British Museum Catalogue enumerates forty different versions of the *Imitatio Christi*. According to Dragonoff's Russian bibliography, books by Count Tolstoi have been printed in forty-five different languages. Finally the Religious Tract Society announces that the *Pilgrim's Progress* has appeared in a hundred different versions. These figures (which are due to Mr. Darlow, in a letter to the writer written a few years since) may need a little supplementing. But it is obvious that the allowance will have to be very generous to bring more than one of these masterpieces up to one-tenth of the total claimed by the Gospels. And as to that exception, it is not likely that any inference we shall draw from the comparison will be affected by the fact that Bunyan is the Bible's nearest approach to a rival—*proximus huic, longo sed proximus intervallo!* Perhaps on second thoughts we should be better advised in urging the Rationalist Press Association to undertake the companion bibliography just now suggested, since the Bible Society is still some way from completing its own more immediate task.

The champions of pure reason ought not to shrink from showing us what the best literature and the most advanced science of our time have done to uplift the various races of mankind. They have been challenged more than once to demonstrate the power of their gospel by entering into competition with the Bible Society and the missionaries. One or two cannibal islands, civilised by the presentation of elementary science and persuasive but non-theological reason, would be a most convincing proof of the strength of the R. P. A. cause. The only answer vouchsafed so far from their side is, if we are correctly informed, that their propaganda cannot command the funds which Christian societies have at their disposal, and that for the present the enlightenment of this country, still sunk in degrading superstition, demands all their energies. Might we not came to their help with a generous subscription? If the rationalist magicians really can do with their enchantments what Christian missions have done unceasingly, it is not to our interest that the experiment should fail merely from lack of money. The only consideration that stays us is that we hesitate to bid our opponents enter a den of lions in which there is no protecting angel to shut the lions' mouths, or to whisper, if so God wills, that though death may be the individual labourer's gate to heaven, the work itself will triumph and abide. For, of course, the argument of this *Catalogue* lies far deeper than the mere fact that Bible translations run into hundreds where other books, even the greatest, can only count their tens. The contrast is not in the number of languages in which the masterpieces of literature now speak, but in the results that follow from the reading of them. To appreciate that contrast we need not travel far from our own door. We know the elevating and purifying influence of good literature, the stimulus and illumination of science and thought. He would proclaim himself a boor and a fool who should despise or belittle what these have done for the elevation of mankind. But the more warmly and heartily we exalt their praise, the more astonishing will appear the contrast of the work done by the artless pages of those little books which the Bible Society and its fellow-workers have carried to the ends of the earth. Scores of times, under our own eyes, a single sentence from them has sufficed to work a change by which the harlot has become pure, the hopeless drunkard sober, the savage brute a tender-hearted husband and father. And what we know of the fruits of our English Bible is matched abundantly by those of all its companion versions. No one with knowledge or imagination could open these volumes at random and fail to recall that nearly any edition on which his eyes may fall has its human documents for commentary. We read only the note of its date, size, and contents, the missionaries who produced and the society that published it; but we are safe in assuming that behind the record lies a wonderful story of lives transformed through its instrumentality. The indifferent man of the world, or the fanatic who has blinded himself by too minute peering into difficulties and unsolved problems, may scoff at this evidence as so much May-meeting enthusiasm. But it is easier to ignore than to explain it. The facts are abundant, and they can be examined and verified.

We are not in the realm of ancient history, where discrepancies of evidence loom large, and men who suffer from hypertrophy of the critical faculty can easily convince themselves that a narrative is unworthy of trust. We are in the midst of present-day realities which challenge interpretation. Men may prove to their own complete satisfaction that Jesus of Nazareth never rose from the dead, never died, and in fact was never born, miraculously or otherwise. We have no need to elaborate a reply: it is better to make a counter challenge. What account can they give of the patent facts around us? How is it that the influence of a man who never existed, or if He existed was wholly like ourselves, is effecting to-day all the world over what no other force can achieve? How does an unsubstantial phantom, or even a mere good man who died nineteen centuries ago, win such incredible victories over deep-seated cruelty and bestiality in human hearts, upon which force and persuasion, medical skill, and educational influences have spent their resources in vain? It is strange 'science' that shirks such a question and reserves all its curiosity for the mechanical phenomena of the material world. The Christian Church in all ages has agreed in explaining the mystery by the recognition of a living Presence among men of One who died, and lo! He is alive for evermore. A recent writer in the *Hibbert Journal* has scornfully insisted on the contrast between scientific theory, which always depends on facts and yields when new and inconsistent facts appear, and theological dogma, which it seems is a presupposition that makes the facts bend to itself. The criticism, after all, is that of an outsider, skilled in science but an amateur in theology. The Church's 'dogma' about the Person of Christ is scientific theory in the sense of Mr. Pattison Muir's exposition. She framed it at the very beginning, to explain facts which had already fulfilled themselves in her midst. She developed it in succeeding generations, as facts of the same class accumulated faster and faster. The theory explains them all, as perfectly as the laws of motion explain the observed places of the planets. There are difficulties, no doubt. The irregularities of Uranus were a profound difficulty to believers in the Newtonian astronomy. But Adams and Leverrier had faith in a theory that had stood the test of experience, and soon a new planet swam into their ken, to be the crowning demonstration that the theory was sound. Has not the central doctrine of Christianity come to us by a similar path? New facts, like those set forth by Charles Darwin in the last generation or by J. G. Frazer in our own, have seemed for a time to shake the great theory. But ere long it is found that they only confirm it. We are perfectly ready to sacrifice the theory—when one is proposed which will explain the facts better. Meanwhile here are three great volumes of plain unadorned facts which fit the Christian theory about Christ with a completeness that should be welcome to a really scientific mind. Is it too much to ask that fair and impartial inquiry may be undertaken to find whether anything less than our theory will account for what we all may see and know?

The *Historical Catalogue* comes then in good time to cheer us in a time of transition when some men's hearts are beginning to quake. God has been silently preparing His own answer for those who have viewed with growing dismay the solvent influences that seem to threaten all we hold most dear. It is no mere coincidence that the development of Biblical criticism and the history of the Bible Society have been outstanding features of the last hundred years for lovers of the Book. The hearts of Christian men have trembled for the Ark of God; and many an Uzzah has hoped by mere human effort to save it from overthrow. God has cared for it in His own way, which is not as our ways. Some biblical critics have come to their task as to a post-mortem dissection; and believers have cried out in horror. But the Book has positively thriven on such dissections. Not a few orthodox theories have been cut away, but only because they prove to be alien growths that would have drained the very life of a subject with less abundant vitality. The real power of the Bible has come out more overwhelmingly as we have seen that these well-meaning theories obscured the very purpose of inspiration. Criticism proved the Bible human—written by human hands, known and unknown, and liable to human error. The Bible Society always unconsciously developed the complementary proof that it is divine, since only by that word can we describe a power that none of our science can interpret. 'Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take!'

Our Scripture is no Koran, that it must be mechanically inspired and verbally inerrant before we can take it as the very word of God. He who might have called us by angel voices, delivering to each of us in our own speech words as infallible and unmistakable as if we read them graven by God's finger on the stone, chose rather to call us through human instruments, that our acceptance of His Gospel might be a work of faith and not of sheer intellectual slavery. We should be poor tools for His employ if the Gospel claimed our allegiance by the same title as the fact that two and two make four.

No one who really ponders missionary problems will think it needless thus to re-iterate the primary lesson to be drawn from the story of the Pentecost that speaks from the shelves of the Bible House Library. The alleged uncertainty of our modern message is just the one thing that most causes stumbling to-day. Missionaries are confronted by educated Hindus who point triumphantly to the downfall of the Bible's credit under the onset of Western learning. The science of the Bible is as naïve as that of the Puranas, even if it be more dignified. Its history includes inaccuracies and anachronisms, just as does that of other sacred books of the East.

The religious development of the people of Israel, as read in the Bible, contains a host of survivals from primitive credulity. Christianity grew up in a perfectly natural way, and the steps of its development can be paralleled one by one from every part of the world. Very well. We can afford to discuss each of these propositions with neither bias nor heat. The acceptance of some of them, when put in a more scientific form and checked by more rigorous methods, may even heighten our sense of wonder before a God who is so much greater than we dreamed. For we have one mighty certainty lying behind all our thoughts of the Man who is the centre and climax of the Book. That human life is indeed surrounded with problems that make the 'Quest of the Historical Jesus' bristle with minor difficulties that we cannot completely solve. What matters it? We stand in a multitude that no man can number, on whom His hand has shed the light. 'One thing I *know*,' say we and they in chorus; 'whereas I was blind, now I see.'

The witness of the power of the Gospel is matched by that to its universal appeal. Verily all sorts and conditions of men may hear in their own language the wonderful works of God. The *Catalogue* includes scores of versions in the simplest and crudest dialects on earth, together with versions in elaborate literary idioms read by the learned alone. At p. 1713 nearly fifty editions are described under the heading 'Zulu'; at p. 1333 we begin to note over a hundred in Sanskrit, including some where Hebrew poetry is rendered into classical verse form. Some seventy pages describe for us the Bible in Chinese. There is classical language and colloquial, the latter in some twenty different forms. The next entry takes us off to North-West Canada, where the Bible Society has provided Gospels for the Chippewyan Indians, a tribe of some five hundred souls. We turn the pages and pass from

Asia and America to Europe, from the rude jargon of small wild tribes, reduced to writing first to carry the Bible message, to the stately and sonorous dialect of some ancient civilisation. No part of the world is unrepresented. In Arctic cold the Eskimo have read the Gospels for nearly two centuries in their own tongue. In India wild hill tribes like the Todas, though they number less than a thousand souls, may read the words which the Brahmin studies in the Sanskrit, and the unity of highest and lowest be reached in Christ. But here is a point that might be more effectively proved by simply transcribing the alphabetic list for a few pages, beginning wherever we chance to open, and appending notes to locate successively these unknown names. And when we remember that all the Versions arose out of a demand, and then created a demand—that they are not books for ornament or curiosity, but for use—we have the evidential side of the *Catalogue* in view once more. It is no racial faith that inspires the Book, but a World-religion, one designed for all the world, and already welcomed by representatives of all the world alike.

It is time that we should pass on to some other lines of thought which a little knowledge and imagination will call up when we range at will over these volumes. Perhaps that which takes us furthest is the growing sense of astonishment that this sort of work can be done at all. Some of us are in our daily work contending with the manifold difficulties besetting us in the attempt to transfer the full meaning of the Greek Testament into English, a language with as rich a vocabulary as Greek itself, and accommodated to Christian thought throughout all the centuries of its existence as a distinct dialect, from a period but little subsequent to its establishment in Britain. Even English has had to take refuge in mere transliteration for not a few words for which our native idiom provided no possible equivalent. They have been naturalised so long that we can with difficulty recognise them as foreign terms; but there was a time when they had to be explained. Such examples may dimly help us to realise the problem that faces the missionary who has to make the Gospels intelligible to a primitive people living under conditions indefinitely remote from those of Palestine in the time of our Lord. There are versions here in which we should be interested to know how the translator represented the word 'tree.' We have all heard of the difficulty raised in the same far northern regions by the attempt to render 'the Lamb.' Such problems show themselves in nearly every line where the translator is working in a dialect in which a few hundred words have hitherto sufficed to meet the simple needs of life. But these are far from being the gravest problems before the pioneer of Bible translation. What of the places where the very idea of God is so clouded or so befouled that no word in the language can possibly be found to express the central Gospel that the missionary comes to bring? What of those where the Christian teacher must invent the very terms in which to state the most elementary conceptions of right and wrong, of sin and forgiveness? A little effort may suffice to put us in the place of these first translators, and fill our minds with hopeless bewilderment as we try to think how we should solve such enigmas. Yet they have been solved; and not the least abiding reflection after studying the *Catalogue* will be one of admiration and thankfulness for the powers of brain as well as heart that are represented here.

There are two pages in Part IV. to which the present writer instinctively turns with deepest pride, to the record of a near relative's life work as a missionary and translator, the fruits of which were largely suppressed by a savage persecution. The record of the Tonga Islands Bible contains in its earliest entry the name of Thomas Adams, Wesleyan Missionary, who was one of the pioneers in the work. The entry is suggestive for those who know that he was John Couch Adams's brother. The astronomer's achievement will be remembered to all time as among the mightiest triumphs of the human brain. His brother's name may stand as a fair type of a great company of men who cut themselves off from any hope of fame, lived in willing exile from home and friends, and died without any taste of this world's prizes, content if they could take the humblest part in the glorious work of bringing an everlasting Gospel to the lowest of mankind. Few of us at home give the missionary a tithe of the due of admiration and pride which he is as slow to claim as we are to bestow. It is well that we should remind ourselves, by the object-lesson just quoted, that brains truly kin to those which have achieved the most justly famous triumphs in all history, have been dedicated in obscurity to a task pre-eminently worthy of their powers. There will be some strange reversals of Fame's earthly awards when we attain the new perspective of the vaster world that lies behind the veil. And if we know anything about the laws of the kingdom of heaven, the great ones there are assuredly those who thought least of self and most of their fellow-man, for His sake who deigned to call the lowliest man His brother. There are relatively few names on the crowded pages of these bulky volumes of which even enthusiasts have heard. But we may read the roll as coming nearer than perhaps any earthly record to the list of heaven's legion of honour. And when in a world that has scanty appreciation for its best and greatest men we have to uphold the claim of our faith upon men's respect and gratitude, we may insist with conviction born of knowledge that as a mere chronicle of intellectual achievment this Historical Catalogue is worthy to stand by the side of the 'Transactions' of any learned society in Europe.

To write about this monumental enterprise adequately, within the limits of the aims of the *Review*, would mean compressing into one paper the whole case of our Bible Society and other societies that pursue the same great end. He would be singularly dull who found it easy to stop when engaged on such a task. As our appointed limits draw near, one has to ask which among many obvious lines we should choose to follow a little further.

The apologetic value of this publication has been the central thought in the present writer's mind ; and it seems natural, therefore, to leave off with a hint of the fertile theme suggested by the results of all this ungrudging labour. Could any one estimate the cost of the work chronicled here ? Through more than a century the British and Foreign Bible Society—one among many, though the greatest of all—has been spending money on an ever-growing scale. The total has been small indeed by comparison with our annual budget in Great Britain for strong drink and for war, small even when compared with really legitimate and beneficent national expenditure. But it represents an immense amount of self-sacrifice. There are halfpence pouring into the Bible Society's treasury which in the currency of the unseen world are worth more than gold. And as page after page of this *Catalogue* bears witness—witness which a full historical commentary upon it would multiply tenfold —there has been an expenditure of life upon this work which surpasses our utmost imagination. How many young men of the highest promise, secure of honourable careers and large incomes at home, have thrown their lives away in some fever-stricken swamp, if only they could win a place upon a roll of honour that the world will never see ! Was it worth it ? Men give large meed of honour to the names of those who fling away life in the necessary or unnecessary task of killing their country's enemies. These men gave life for the saving of men's lives, for the uplift of society, for the winning of the savage into civilisation and humanity and religion. Most manifestly the Word of God, on the testimony of this great volume, has not returned unto Him void. We might go over its pages to see in how many cases since the Gothic Bible of the fourth century the art of writing was applied for the first time to communicate the Gospel message, how often a literature owed its birth to the Book of books transplanted into the vernacular of a hitherto unlettered people. We might read the story to which most pages of the *Catalogue* would refer us, telling how the missionary at the risk of his life entered a wild new land and brought the Book with him and the Presence which still gives the Book its power. And at his coming the wilderness and the solitary place was glad, and the desert blossomed as the rose. So long as material grows for the supplementing of this wonderful volume—and there are already many pages to be added in description of work done since it went to the press—no advocate of Christianity need speak with bated breath, as though defending some outworn creed, as the ambassador of some absentee divinity. Such a book is the irrefragable witness of a faith that lives and conquers still, however loudly its enemies may shout and some of its timid defenders lament. It is the enshrinement of the victorious fact proclaimed in one of the last-written prophecies of Scripture: 'There are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they shall be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself will not contain the books that shall be written.'

One word of personal tribute should be added before we close. The labour involved in this colossal work is obvious to any one who casually turns its pages. The Literary Superintendent of the Bible Society, his time already filled with the ordinary duties of an arduous office, has naturally been able only to take a second place in the toil of the great enterprise. He bids us assign the larger share of our gratitude to his colleague, Mr. H. F. Moule, who has given his whole time to the work through twelve years. We will gladly obey, and then make the tribute even by remembering the work that has kept Mr. Darlow from doing his full share. It is good to read how many scholars of high repute, belonging as in all the enterprises of the Society to every section of the Church of Christ, have counted it a privilege to work for the great cause. The result is one of which the Society and all good Christians may be proud. We have not sought for flaws: it is not easy to see where one could qualify for the search, except in a page or two here and there, where specialist's knowledge may come in. That no toil has been spared to make the work accurate, no grace of loving enthusiasm wanting to make it worthy of its name, is clear to all who read. May this adequate monument of the Society, which is one of Great Britain's highest titles to world-wide honour, be in its harvest of results all that Christian enthusiasm will desire!

Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

Moulton, J. H. 65499 204R
M862

The Christian religion in the study + the street.

1919 May 6	Barnes	May 24			
1919	The				

204R
M862

0

65499